

11. v. 2

# THE ERRATA TO THE Protestant Bible, OR, THE T R U T H OF THEIR English Translations Examin'd,

In a Treatise shewing some of the Errors that are to be found in the Protestant English Translations of the Sacred Scripture, against such Points of Catholick Doctrine as are in Debate between Them and the Church of ROME.

In which also, from their Mis-translating the Twenty Third Verse of the Fourteenth Chapter of the *Act's of the Apostles*, the Consecration of Dr. Matthew Parker, the First Protestant Arch-Bishop of CANTERBURY, is Occasionally Consider'd.

By T. Ward

Apocalyps, cap. 12. ver. 18, 19.

Contestor enim omni audienti verba Prophetiae libri hujus: Si quis apposuerit ad hæc apponet Deus super illum plagas Scriptas in libro isto. Et si quis diminuerit de verbis libri Prophetiae hujus, auferet Deus partem ejus de Libro vite, & de Crotitate Santa, & de his quæ Scripta sunt in libro isto.

With allowance.

LONDON, Printed for the Author, And Sold by most Booksellers. 1688.



90K

2

# THE P R E F A C E.



Mong the many and irreconcileable Differences between Roman Catholicks, and the Sectaries of our days, Those about the Holy Scriptures claim not the least place on the Stage of Controverſie: As, First, Whether the Bible is the Sole and only Rule of Faith? Secondly, Whether all things necessary to Salvation, are contain'd in the Bible? Or, Whether we are bound to believe some things, as absolutely necessary to Salvation, which are either not clear in Scripture, or not evidently deduc'd out of Scripture? Thirdly, Whether every individual Person, of sound Judgment, ought to follow his own private Interpretation of the Scripture? If so, Why one Party or Profession should Condemn, Persecute, and Penal-Law Another, for being of that Perswafion he finds most agreeable to the Scripture, as expounded according to his own Private Spirit? If not, To what Interpreter ought they to submit themselves, and on whom may they safely and securely depend, touching the Exposition and true Sence and Meaning of the same? Fourthly, Whence we have the Scripture? that is, who handed it down to Us from the Apostles, that Writ it? And by what Authority we receive it for the Word of God? And, Whether we ought not to receive the Sence and true Meaning of the Scripture, upon the same Authority we receive the Letter? For if Protestants think, the Letter was safe in the Custody of the Roman Catholick Church, from which they receiv'd it, How can they suspect the Purity of that Sence, which was kept and delivered to them by the same Church and Authority? With several other such like Queries, frequently proposed by Catholicks; and never yet, nor ever like to be, solidly Answer'd by any Sectaries what-ever.

'Tis not the Design of this following Treatise to enter into these Disputes; But only to shew Thee (Christian Reader) that those Translations of the Bible, which the English Protestant Clergy have made and presented to the People, for Their Only Rule of Faith, are in many places not only Partial, but False, and disfigured with several Corruptions, Abuses and Falsifications, in Derogation to the most material Points of Catholick Doctrine, and in Favour and Advantage of their own Erroneous Opinions: For,

As it has been the Custom of Hereticks in all Ages, to pretend to Scripture Alone for their Rule, and to reject the Authority of Gods Holy Church; so has it also ever been their Practice to Falsify, Corrupt, and Abuse the same in divers manners.

1. One way is, To deny whole Books thereof, or parts of Books, when they are evidently against them; so did (for Example) Ebion all St. Pauls Epistles; Manicheus the Acts of the Apostles; Luther likewise deny'd three of the four Gospels, saying, That St. John's is the only true Gospel; and so do our English Protestants those Books which they call Apocrypha.

2. Another way is, To call in question at the least, and make some doubt of the Authority of certain Books of Holy Scriptures, thereby to diminish their Credit; So did Manicheus affirm, That the whole New Testament was not writ by the Apostles, and peculiarly St. Matthews Gospel: So does Luther discredit the Epistle of St. James: So did Marcion and the Arians deny the Epistle to the Hebrews to be St. Pauls, in which they were follow'd

# The P R E F A C E.

See Bible  
1579, 1085

by our first English Protestant Translators of the Bible, who presum'd to strike St. Paul's Name out of the very Title of the said Epistle.

3. Another way is, To expound the Scripture according to their own private Spirit, and to reject the approved Sense of the Holy Antient Fathers, and Catholick Church: So do all Hereticks, who seem to ground their Errors upon the Scriptures; especially those, who will have Scripture, as by themselves Expounded, for their Only Rule of Faith.

4. Another way is, To alter the very Original Text of the Holy Scriptures, by Adding, Diminishing, or Changing it here and there for their purpose: So did the Arians, Nestorians, &c. and also Marcion; who is therefore call'd Mus Ponticus, from his gnawing (as it were) certain places with his Corruptions; and for the same reason may Beza not improperly be call'd the Mouse of Geneva.

5. Another way (not unlike to this) is, To make Corrupt and False Translations of the Scriptures for the Maintenance of their Errors: So did the Arians and Pelagians of old, and so have done the pretended Reformers of our days, which I intend to make the Subject of this following Treatise.

Let, before I proceed any further, let me first assure my Reader, That this Work is not undertaken on any design of lessening the Credit or Authority of the Holy Bible, as perhaps some may be ready to Surmise: For indeed, 'tis a common Exclamation among our Adversaries, (especially such of them as one would think should have a greater respect for Truth,) That Catholicks set light by the written word of God: That they undervalue and contemn the Sacred Scriptures: That they endeavour to lessen the Credit and Authority of the Holy Bible. Thus possessing the poor deluded people with an ill opinion of Catholicks, as if they rejected, and trod under feet, the Written Word: Whereas 'tis evident to all, who know them, That none can have a greater Respect and Veneration for the Holy Scripture, than Catholicks have, Receiving, Reverencing, and Honouring the same, as the very Pure and True Word of God; neither rejecting, nor so much as doubting of the least tittle in the Bible, from the beginning of Genesis, to the end of the Apocalyps; several devout Catholicks having that profound Veneration for it, that they always Read it kneeling on their Knees, with the greatest Humility and Reverence imaginable, not enduring to see it profan'd in any kind; nor so much as to see the least torn leaf of a Bible put to any manner of unseemly use. Those who, besides all this, consider with what very indifferent behaviour the Scripture is ordinarily handled among Protestants, will not, I am confident, say, that Catholicks have a less regard for it, than Protestants have; but, on the contrary, a far greater.

Again, dear Reader, If thou find'st in any part of this Treatise, that the Nature of the Subject has Extorted from me such Expressions, as may perhaps seem either spoken with too much heat, or not altogether so soft, as might be wisht for; yet, let me desire thee, not to look upon them as the dictates of Passion, but rather as the just resentments of a Zealous Mind, mov'd with the Incentive of seeing Gods Sacred Word adulterated and corrupted by Ill designing Men, on purpose to delude and deceive the ignorant and unwary Reader.

The Holy Scriptures were Written by the Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists; The Old Testament in Hebrew, (except only some few parts in Chaldee and Syriack;) The greatest part of the New Testament, was writ in Greek, St. Matthew's Gospel in Hebrew, and St. Mark's in Latin. We have not at this day the Original Writings of these Prophets and Apostles, nor of the 70. Interpreters, who Translated the Old Testament into Greek about 300 years before the coming of Christ; We have only Copies; for the Truth and Exactness whereof, we must rely upon the Testimony and Tradition of the Church, which in so Important a point, God would never permit to Err: So that we have not the least doubt, but the Copy, Authori-

## The P R E F A C E.

Authorized and Approved on by the Church, is sufficiently Authentick; for what avails it for a Christian to Believe, that Scripture is the Word of God, if he be uncertain which Copy and Translation is True? Yet, notwithstanding the necessity of admitting Some true Authentick Copy, Protestants pretend that there is None Authentick in the World, as may be seen in the Preface of the Tigurine Edition of the Bible, and in all their Books of Controversie; seeing therein they condemn the Council of Trent, for declaring that the Old Translation is Authentick, and yet themselves name no other for such: And therefore, tho' the Lutherans fancy Luther's Translation; The Calvinists that of Geneva; The Zuinglians that of Zuinglius; The English, sometimes one, and sometimes another: Yet because they do not hold any One to be Authentick, it follows (from their Exceptions against the Infallibility of the Roman-Catholick-Church in Declaring or Decreeing a True and Authentick Copy of Scripture, and their Confession of the uncertainty of their own Translations) That they have no certainty of Scripture at all, nor even of FAITH, which they ground upon Scripture Alone.

That the Vulgata of the Latin is the most True and Authentick Copy, has been the Judgment of Gods Church for above this 1300 Years; during which time, the Church has always us'd it; and therefore it is by the Sacred Council † of Trent declar'd Authentick and Canonical in every part and Book thereof.

Most of the Old Testament, as it is in the said Latin Vulgata, was Translated \* out of Hebrew by St. Hierom; And the New Testament had been before his time Translated out of Greek, but was by him † Review'd; and such Faults as had crept in by the negligence of the Transcribers, were Corrected by him at the Appointment of Pope Damasus. You constrain me (says he) to make a New work of an Old, that I (after so many Copies of the Scriptures) dispers'd through the World, should sit as a certain Judge, which of them agree with the true Greek. ---- I have restor'd the New Testament to the Truth of the Greek, and have Translated the Old according to the Hebrew. -- Truly, I will affirm it confidently, and will produce many Witnesses of this Work, that I have chang'd nothing from the Truth of the Hebrew, &c.

And for sufficient Testimony of the Sincerity of the Translator, and Commendations of his Translation, read these Words of the Great Doctor St. Augustin:--- There was not wanting (says he) in these our days, Hierom the Priest, a Man most Learned and Skilful in all the Three Tongues; who not from the Greek, but from the Hebrew, Translated the same Scriptures into Latin, whose Learned Labour the Jews yet confess to be true:

Tea, the Truth and Purity of this Translation is such, That even the bitterest of Protestants themselves are forc't to Confess it to be the best, and to prefer it before all others, as also to acknowledge the Learning, Piety, and Sincerity of the Translator of it; Which Mr. Whittaker (notwithstanding his Railing in another place) does in these Words.--- St. Hierom, I Reverence; Damasus, I Command; and the Work I confess to be Godly and profitable to the Church.

Dr. Dove says thus of it;--- We grant it fit, that for Uniformity in quotations of Places, in Schools and Pulpits, one Latin Text should be us'd: And we can be contented, for the Antiquity thereof, to prefer that [The Vulgata] before all other Latin Books.

And for the Antiquity of it, Dr. Covel tells us, That it was us'd in the Church 1300 years ago: Not doubting but to Prefer that Translation before others.

Dr. Humphrey frees St. Hierom, both from Malice and Ignorance in Translating, in these words. --- The Old Interpreter was much addicted to the Propriety of the Words, and indeed with too much Anxiety, which I attribute to Religion, not to Ignorance.

In regard of which Integrity and Learning, Molinæus dignifies his good esteem thereof,

† Corc. Trident. Sess. 4.  
\* St. Hierom in lib. de viris illustr. extre-  
mæ, & in Pra-  
fix. librorum  
quos Latinos  
fecit.

† Hier. Ep. 89.  
ad Aug. quæst.  
11. inter Ep.  
Aug.

See his Pre-  
face before the  
New Testa-  
ment, dedica-  
ted to Pope  
Damasus and  
his Catalogue  
in fine.

St. Aug. de  
Civit. Dei  
lib. 18. c. 43.  
& ep. 80. ad  
Hierom c. 3.  
& lib. 2. Doct.  
Christi, c. 15.

Whittaker in  
his Answer to  
Reynolds,  
p. 241.

Dove, Per-  
sification to  
Recusants,  
pag. 16. ---

See Dr. Corc.  
Answer to  
Burges, p. 91.  
94.

Dr. Hum-  
phrey de Ratione  
Interp. lib. 1.  
pag. 73.

# The P R E F A C E.

Molin. in  
Nov. Test.  
Part. 30.  
† Et in Luc.  
17.

Pellican in  
Praefat. in  
Psalter Anno  
1584.

Beza in  
Annot. in  
Luc. 1. 1.  
Et in Prae-  
fat. Nov. Test.  
† S. Hieron.  
& St. Aug.  
Supr.  
S. Greg.  
lib. 70. Mor.  
c. 23. Isidor.  
lib. 6. Etym.  
c. 5. 7. & de  
Divin. Offic.  
l. 1. c. 12.  
S. Beda in  
Martyrol.  
Cassiod. 21.  
Inst. Ec.  
Object.

Answ.

+ 2 Chron.  
28. ver. 19.

4 Kings 24.  
ver. 17. 19.

Humph. lib. 1.  
de rat. interp.  
pag. 178.

saying, ---- I cannot easily forsake the vulgar and accustom'd Reading, which also I am accustom'd earnestly to defend: Yea, † I prefer the *Vulgar Edition*, before *Erasmus*, *Bucer*, *Bullinger*, *Brentius*, the *Tigurine Translation*; yea, before *John Calvin's*, and all others: *How Honourably he speaks of it!* And yet,

Conradus Pellican, (*a Man commended by Bucer, Zuinglius, Melancthon, and all the famous Protestants about Basil, Tigure, Berne, &c.*) gives it a far higher Commendation, in these Words: ---- I find the Vulgar Edition of the Psalter to agree for the Sence, with such Dexterity, Learning, and Fidelity of the Hebrew, that I doubt not, but the Greek and Latin Interpreter was a Man most Learned, most Godly, and of a Prophetical Spirit. Which certainly are the best Properties of a Good Translator.

In fine, Even Beza himself, one of the Greatest of our Adversaries, affords this Honourable Testimony of our *Vulgar Translation*: ---- I confess, (*says he*) that the Old Interpreter seems to have Interpreted the Holy Books with wonderful Sincerity and Religion. The Vulgar Edition I do, for the most part, Embrace and Prefer before all others.

You see, how highly our *Vulgata in Latin* is commended by these Learned Protestants: See likewise, how it has been esteem'd by the Antient † Fathers: Yet notwithstanding all this is not sufficient to move Protestants to accept or acquiesce in it; and doubtless the very reason is, because they would have as much liberty to reject the True Letter, as the True Sence of Scripture, their New Doctrines being condemn'd by both. For had they allow'd any one Translation to have been Authentick, they certainly could never have had the Impudence so wickedly to have Corrupted it, by Adding, Omitting, and Changing, which they could never have pretended the least excuse for, in any Copy by themselves held for True and Authentick.

But however, their greatest Objection against the *Vulgata Latin* is, That we ought rather to have recourse to the Original Languages, the Fountains of the Hebrew and Greek, in which the Scriptures were written by the Prophets and Apostles, who could not Err; than to stand to the Latin Translations, made by divers Interpreters, who might Err.

Answ. When 'tis certain, that the Originals or Fountains are Pure, and not Troubled or Corrupt, they are to be prefer'd before Translations: But 'tis most certain, that they are corrupted in divers places, as Protestants themselves are forc'd to acknowledge, and as it appears by their own Translations; For Example, Psal. 22. ver. 16. they Translate, They pierc'd my Hands and my Feet: Whereas, according to the Hebrew that now is, It must be read, — As a Lyon, my Hands, and my Feet; which no doubt, is not only Nonsense, but an Intollerable Corruption of the latter Jews against the Passion of our Saviour, of which the Old Authentick Hebrew was a most remarkable Prophetic. Again, according to the Hebrew, it is read, † Achaz, King of Israel; which being false, they in some of their first Translations read, Achaz, King of Juda, according to the Truth, and as it is the Greek and Vulgar Latin; Yet their Bible 1579, as also their last Translation, had rather follow the falsehood of the Hebrew against their own knowledge, than to be thought beholding to the Greek or Latin in so light a matter. Likewise, where the Hebrew says, Zedecias [Joachin's] Brother, they are forc'd to Translate Zedecias his Fathers Brother, as indeed the Truth is, according to the Greek. So likewise in another place, where the Hebrew is, He begat Azuba his Wife and Jerioth; which they not easily knowing what to make of, Translate in some of their Bibles, He begat Azuba of his Wife Jerioth; and in others, He begat Jerioth of his Wife Azuba. But without multiplying Examples, 'tis sufficiently known to Protestants, and by them acknowledg'd, how intollerably the Hebrew Fountains and Originals are by the Jews corrupted: Am'ngst others, Dr. Humphry says, The Jewish Superstition, how many places it has corrupted, the Reader may easily find out and Judge.

And

## The P R E F A C E.

And in another place; I look not, says he, that Men should too much follow the Rab-  
bins, as many do; for those places, which promise and declare Christ the true Messias,  
are most filthily deprav'd by them.

Lib. 2.  
pag. 219.

The Old Interpreter (*says another Protestant*) seems to have read one way, whereas  
the Jews now read another; which I say, because I would not have men think this to  
have proceeded from the Ignorance or Slothfulness of the Old Interpreter: Rather  
we have cause to find fault for want of Diligence in the Antiquaries, and Faith in the  
Jews; who, both before Christ's coming and since, seem to be less careful of the *Psalms*,  
than of their *Talmudical Songs*.

Conrad. Pell.  
Tom. 4. in.  
Psal. 85. v. 9.

I would gladly know of our Protestant Translators of the Bible, what reason they have to  
think the Hebrew Fountain (*they boast of*) so Pure and Uncorrupt, seeing not only  
Letters and Syllables have been mistaken, Texts deprav'd, but even whole Books of the  
Prophets utterly lost and Perisb'd? How many Books of the Antient Prophets, sometime  
Extant, are not now to be found? We read in the Old Testament, of a Liber Bellorum  
Domini, The Book of the Wars of our Lord; The Book of the Just Men, [*Protestants call it the Book of Jasher.*] The Book of *Jehu* the Son of *Hanani*; The  
Books of *Semeias* the Prophet, and of *Addo* the Seer: And *Samuel* wrote in a Book  
the Law of the Kingdom, (how Kings ought to Rule,) and laid it up before our Lord:  
And the Works of *Solomon* were Written in the Book of *Nathan* the Prophet, and in the  
Books of *Abias* the Shilonite, and in the Vision of *Addo* the Seer: With several others,  
which are all quite perisb't; *Tea*, and perished in such a time, when the Jews were the pecu-  
liar People of God, and when, of all Nations, they were to God a holy Nation, a Kingly  
Priesthood: And now, when they are no National People, have no Government, no King,  
no Priest, but are Vagabonds upon the Earth, and scatter'd among all People; may we reasonably  
think their Divine and Ecclesiastical Books to have been so warily and carefully kept, that  
all and every part is safe, pure, and incorrupt; that every parcel is sound, no points, tittles,  
or letters lost, or misplac'd, but all sincere, perfect, and absolute?

Numb.  
21. ver. 14.  
Josh. 10.  
v. 13. 2 Kings  
1. ver. 18.  
2 Paral  
ver. 34.  
12. v. 15.  
1 King. 10.  
ver. 25.  
2 Paral.  
9. ver. 29.

How easie it is, in Hebrew Letters, to mistake sometimes one for another, and so to alter  
the whole sence? As for Example, This very Letter [vau] for [jod] has certainly made  
disagreement in some places; as where the Septuagint read,  $\tau\alpha\kappa\pi\tau\alpha\mu\tau\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\pi\tau\alpha$ ,  
Fortitudinem meam ad te custodiam, My Strength I will keep to thee; which Reading  
St. Hierom also follow'd: It is now in the Hebrew [י] fortitudinem ejus, His  
Strength I will keep to thee: Which Corruptions our last Frotestant Translators follow,  
Reading, Because of his Strength will I wait upon thee; and to make Sence on't, they add  
the words [because of,] and change the word [keep to] into [wait upon,] to the great  
perverting of the Sence and Sentence. A like Error is that in Gen. 3. (If it be an Error,  
as many very probably think 'tis none,) Ipsi conteret caput tuum, for Ipsi or Ipsum, above  
which Protestants keep such a Clamour.

Psal. 58. v. 10.  
in Prot. Bible,  
it is Psal. 59.  
ver. 9.

Gen. 3. v. 15.  
יְנִזְבֵּחַ  
יְנִזְבֵּחַ

As the Hebrew has been by the Jews abus'd and falsify'd against our Blessed Saviour  
Christ Jesus, especially in such places as were manifest Prophesies of his Death and Passion:  
So likewise has the Greek Fountain been Corrupted by the Eastern Hereticks, against divers  
points of Christian Doctrine; insomuch that Protestants themselves, who pretend so great  
Veneration for it, dare not follow it in many places; but are forc't to fly to our Vulgar  
Latin, as is observed in the Preface to the Rhemish Testament; where also you may find  
sufficient Reasons, why our Catholick Bible is Translated into English rather from the Vul-  
gata Latin, than from the Greek.

To pass by several Examples of Corruptions in the Greek Copy, which might be produc'd,  
I will only, amongst many, take notice of these two following rash and inconsiderate Additions:

## The P R E F A C E.

IN X. J. 8. 59.  
μέτρον  
τοῦ μεσοῦ  
τοῦ.

Beza in Job.  
cap. 8. ver. 59.

*First, Joh. 8. ver. 59. after these words, Exiit è Templo, Went out of the Temple; are added, Transiens per medium eorum, Sic præteriit; Going through the midst of them, and so passed by. Touching which Addition, Beza writes thus; These words are found in very Antient Copies; but I think, as does Erasmus, that the first part, [Going through the midst of them] is taken out of Luk. 4. ver. 30. and crept into the Text by fault of the Writers, who found that written in the Margent: And that the latter part [and so passed by] was added to make this Chapter joyn well with the next. And I am mov'd thus to think, not only because neither Chrysostom, nor Augustin, ( he might have said, nor Hierom ) make any mention of this Piece; but also, because it seems not to hang together very probably; for, if he withdrew himself out of their sight, how went he through the mid'st of them? &c. Thus Beza disputes against it; for which cause ( I suppose ) it is omitted by our English first Translators, who love to follow what their Master Beza delivers them in Latin, though forsooth they would have us think, they follow'd the Greek most precisely; for in their Translations of the Year 1561, 1562, 1577, 1579, they leave it out, as Beza does: Yet in their Testament of 1580, as also in this last Translation, ( Bib. 1683. ) they put it in, with as much confidence as if it had neither been disputed against by Beza, nor omitted by their former Brethren.*

Erasmus in  
Annot.  
Bullinger  
Decade. 5.  
Sermon. 5.

Beza in Praef.  
Nov. Test.  
Anno 1556.

See the Praef.  
to the Rhem.  
Test.  
Dr. Martin's  
Discovery.  
Reynold's  
Refutation of  
Whistaker,  
cap. 13.

*To this we may also joyn that piece which Protestants so gloriously Sing and Say at the end of the Lord's Prayer, [For thine is the Kingdom, the Power and Glory, for ever and ever, Amen,] which not only Erasmus dislikes, but Bullinger himself holds it for a meer Patch Sow'd to the rest, by he knows not whom: And allows well of Erasmus's Judgment, reproving Laurentius Valla for finding fault with the Latin Edition, because it wants it: —— There is no reason ( says he ) why Laurentius Valla should take the matter so hotly, as though a great part of the Lords Prayer were cut away: rather their rashness was to be reprovd, who durst presume to piece on their Toys unto the Lord's Prayer.*

*Let not my Reader think, that our Latin Vulgata differs from the true and most Authentick Greek Copies, which were extant in St. Hierom's days, but only from such as are now Extant, and since his days Corrupted. How unworthily ( says Beza ) and without Cause, does Erasmus blame the Old Interpreter, as dissenting from the Greek? He dis-sented, I grant, from those Greek Copies which Erasmus had gotten; but we have not found in one place, that the same Interpretation which he blames, is grounded on the Authority of other Greek Copies, and those most Antient: Yea, in some number of places we have observ'd, that the Reading of the Latin Text of the Old Interpreter, though it agree sometime with our Greek Copies, yet it is much more convenient, for that it seems to follow some truer and better Copy.*

*Now, if our Latin Vulgata be fram'd exactly, though not to the Vulgar Greek Examples now Extant, yet to more Antient and perfect Copies; If the Greek Copies have many Faults, Errors, Corruptions, and Additions in them, as not only Beza avouches, but as our Protestant Translators Confess, and as evidently appears by their leaving the Greek, and following the Latin: With what Reason can they thus cry up the Fountains and Originals, as incorrupted and pure? With what Honesty can they call us from our Antient Vulgar Latin, to the present Greek, from which themselves so licenciously depart at pleasure, to follow our Latin?*

*Have we not great reason to think, that as the Latin Church has been ever more constant in keeping the true Faith, than the Greek; so it has always been more careful in preserving the Scriptures from Corruption.*

*Let Protestants only consider, whether it be more Credible that St. Hierom, one of the greatest Doctors of God's Church, and the most skilful in the Languages wherein the Scripture*

*Scripture*

# The P R E F A C E.

Scripture was Written, who liv'd in the Primitive times, when perhaps some of the Original Writings of the Apostles were Extant, or at least the True and Authentick Copies in Hebrew and Greek better known than now they are: Let us then consider, (I say) whether is more Credible, that a Translation made or receiv'd by this Holy Doctor, (and then approv'd of by all the World, and ever since accepted and applauded in God's Church) should be Defective, False, or Deceitful: or, That a Translation made since the pretended Reformation, not only by Men of Scandalous, and Notorious Wicked Lives, but from Copies corrupted by Jews, Arians, and other Greek Hereticks, should be so?

Such were  
Luther, Cal-  
vin, Beza,  
Bucer, Cran-  
mer, Tindale,  
&c.

In vain therefore do Protestants tell us, That their Translations are taken immediately from the Fountains of the Greek and Hebrew; So is also our Latin Vulgata; only with this difference, That Ours was taken from the Fountains when they were Clear, and by Holy and Learned Men, who knew which were the Chrystal Waters, and True Copies; But Theirs is taken from Fountains troubled by broachers of Heresies, Self-Interested, and Time-Serving Persons; And after that the Arians, and other Hereticks had (I say) Corrupted and Poyson'd them with their false and abominable Doctrines.

Chemnitius and others yet further Object, That there are some Corruptions found in the Vulgar Latin, viz. That these Words, [Ipsa conteret Caput tuum] are Corrupted, thereby to prove the Intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary; and that instead thereof, we should read, *Ipsum Conteret Caput tuum*, seeing it was spoken of the Seed which was Christ, as all Antient Writers Teach.

Answ. Some Books of the Vulgar Edition, have [Ipsa,] and some others [Ipse;] and though many Hebrew Copies have Ipse, yet there want not some which have Ipsa; and the Points being taken away, the Hebrew word may be Translated Ipsa: *Tea, the Holy Fathers, St. Augustin, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Gregory, St. Bede, &c.* read it [Ipsa,] and I think we have as great reason to follow their Interpretation of it, as Chemnitius's, or the Protestants of our days: And though the word (Conteret) in the Hebrew, be of the Masculine Gender, and so should relate to Semen, which also in the Hebrew, is of the Masculine Gender; yet 'tis not rare in the Scriptures to have Pronouns and Verbs of the Masculine Gender, joyn'd with Nouns of the Feminine, as in Ruth 1. 8. Esther 1. 20. Eccles. 12. 5. The rest of Chemnitius's Cavils you'll find sufficiently Answered by the Learned Cardinal Bellarmine, *Lib. 2. de verb. Dei, cap. 12. 13, 14.*

Object. 2.

Gen. 3.

\* St. Augus.  
lib. 1. de Gen.  
conr. Manich.  
c. 18. L. 1. de  
Gen. ad Litera-  
ram cap. 36.  
S. Ambr. lib.  
de Fuga Sz-  
eculi, cap. 7.  
S. Chrysost. in  
Hom. 17. in  
Gen.  
S. Greg. lib. 1.  
Mor. cap. 38.  
Beds, & alii  
in hunc lo-  
cum.

Again, Mr. Whittaker condemns us for following our Latin Vulgata so precisely, as thereby to omit these words, (When this Corruptible, shall have put on Incorruption) which are in the Greek Exemplars, but not in our Vulgar Latin: Whence it follows assuredly, (says he) that Hierom dealt not faithfully here, or that his Version was corrupted afterwards.

I Answer to this, (with Dr. Reynolds) That this Omission (if it be any,) could not proceed of Malice or Design, seeing there is no loss or hindrance to any part of Doctrine, by Reading as we Read; for the self-same thing is most clearly set down in the very next lines before, thus stands the Words: For this Corruptible, must do on Incorruption; and this Mortal, do on Immortality: And when this (Corruptible, has done on Incorruption, and this) Mortal has done on Immortality. Where you see the Words, which I have put down, inclosed within the Parenthesis, ( ) are contain'd m<sup>st</sup> expressly in the foregoing Sentence, which is in all our Testaments; so that there is no harm or danger either to Faith, Doctrine, or Manners, if it be omitted.

1 Cor. c. 15.

v. 54.

See Dr. Re-  
nold's  
Refutation of  
Weisker's  
Reprehen-  
sions, cap. 13.

That it was of Old in some Greek Copies, as it stands in our Vulgar Latin, is evident by St. Hierom's Translating of it thus: And why ought St. Hierom to be suspected of unfaithful dealing, seeing he put the self-same Words and Sense in the next lines immediately

## The P R E F A C E.

S. Beda in  
1 Cor. c. 15.

preceding? And that it was not Corrupted since, appears by the common Reading of most Men, in all after-Ages. St. Ambrose in his Commentary upon the same place, reads as we do. So does St. Augustin, De Civitate Dei, cited by St. Bede, in his Commentary upon the same Chapter. So read also the rest of the Catholick Interpreters, Haymo, Anselm, &c.

But if this place be rightly consider'd, so far it is from appearing, as done with any design of corrupting the Text, that on the contrary, it apparently shews the sincerity of our Latin Translation: For, as we keep our Text, according as St. Hierom and the Church then deliver'd it; so notwithstanding, because the said words are in the Antient Greek Copies, we generally add them in the Margent of every Latin Testament, which the Church uses, as may be seen in divers Prints of Paris, Lovain, and other Universities: And if there be any fault in our English Translation, 'tis only that this Particle was not put down in the Margent, as it was in the Latin, which we follow'd. So that this, I say, proves no Corruption, but rather great Fidelity in our Latin Testament, that it agrees with St. Hierom, and consequently with the Greek Copies, which he Interpreted, as with St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Bede, Haymo, and St. Anselm.

Whether these vain and frivolous Objections are sufficient grounds for their Rejecting our Vulgar Latin, and flying to the Original (but now impure) Fountains, I refer to the Judicious Reader.

But now, how Clear, Limpid, and Pure, the Streams are, that flow from the Greek and Hebrew Fountains, through the Channels of Protestant Pens, the Reader may easily guess (without taking the pains of comparing them) from the Testimonies they themselves bear of one anothers Translations.

Zuing. Tom.  
2. ad Luth.  
lib. de S.

Zuinglius writes thus to Luther, concerning his Corrupt Translation; Thou corruptest the Word of God, (O Luther;) Thou art seen to be a manifest and common Corrupter and Perverter of the Holy Scripture; How much are we ashamed of thee, who have hitherto esteem'd thee beyond all Measure, and now prove thee to be such a Man?

Keckerman.  
Syst. 8. Theol.  
lib. 2. p. 188.  
1 St. Job. 5. 7.

To. 5. Germ.  
fol. 14r, 144.

Luther's Dutch Translation of the Old Testament, especially of Job and the Prophets, has its Blemishes, says Keckerman, and those no small ones. Neither are the Blemishes in his New Testament to be accounted small ones; One of which is, his omitting and wholly leaving out this Text in St. John's Epistle; (There be Three who give Testimony in Heaven; The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One.) --- Again, in Rom. 3.28. He adds the word (ALONE) to the Text, saying, We account a Man to be Justify'd by Faith ALONE, without the Works of the Law. Of which Intolerable Corruption being Admonish'd, he persisted Obstinate and Wilful, saying, So I Will, so I Command; let my Will be instead of Reason, &c. Luther will have it so: And at last thus concludes, The Word (ALONE) must remain in my New Testament, altho' all the Papists run Mad, they shall not take it from thence: It grieves me, that I did not add also those two other Words, OMNIBVS & OMNIUM, sine Omnibus Operibus, Omnia Legum; Without (All) Works of (All) Laws.

\* See Zuing.  
Tom. 2. ad  
Luth. lib. de  
Sac. fol. 388,  
389.

\* Hosp. Hist.  
Sacram. part.  
ult. fol. 183.  
Iavath. Hist.  
Sacram. 1. 32.

Again, in reproof to Zuinglius, Luther rejects the Zuinglian Translation, terming them in matter of Divinity, Fools, Asses, Anti-christs, Deceivers, &c. and indeed, not without Cause; for what could be more Deceitful and Anti-christian, than instead of our Saviour's Words, (This is my Body,) to Translate, This signifies my Body, as Zuinglius did, to maintain his Figurative signification of the Words, and cry down Christ's Real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament?

When Froscheverus, the Zuinglian Printer of Zurick, sent Luther a Bible Translated by the Divines there; He would not receive it; but, as \* Hospinian, and Lavatherus witness, sent it back, and rejected it.

The

## The P R E F A C E.

*The Tigurine Translation was in like manner so distastful to other Protestants, That the Elector of Saxony in great Anger rejected it, and plac'd Luther's Translation in Room thereof.*

*Beza reproves the Translation set forth by Oecolampadius, and the Divines of Basil; affirming, That the Basil Translation is in many places wicked, and altogether differing from the Mind of the Holy Ghost.*

*Castalio's Translation is also Condemn'd by \* Beza, as being Sacrilegious, Wicked, and Ethnical; insomuch that Castalio Writ a special Treatise in Defence of it: In the Preface of which he thus Complains, —— Some reject our Latin and French Translations of the Bible, not only as Unlearned, but also as Wicked, and differing in many places from the Mind of the Holy Ghost.*

*That Learned Protestant, † Molinæus, affirms of Calvin's Translation, That Calvin in his Harmony, makes the Text of the Gospel to leap up and down; He uses Violence to the Letter of the Gospel; and besides this, adds to the Text.*

*And touching Beza's Translation, (which our English especially follow) the same Molinæus \* Charges him, that He actually changes the Text; giving likewise several Instances of his Corruptions. Castalio also, a learned Calvinist, (as Osiander says) and skilful in the Tongues, reprobates Beza in a Book wholly written against his Corruptions; and says further, † I will not Note all his Errors, for that would require too large a Volume.*

*In short, Bucer and the Osiandrians, rise up against Luther for false Translations; Luther against Munster; Beza against Castalio; and Castalio against Beza; Calvin against Servetus; Illyricus both against Calvin and Beza. Staphylus and Emserus noted in Luther's Dutch Translation of the New Testament only, about 1400. Heretical Corruptions. And thus far of the Confess'd Corruptions in Foreign Protestant Translations.*

*If you desire a Character of our English Protestant Versions, pray be pleased to take it from the Words of these following Protestants; some of the most Zealous and precise of whom, in a certain Treatise, Entituled, A Petition directed to his most Excellent Majesty King J A M E S the First, Complains, That Our Translation of the Psalms, comprised in our Book of Common-Prayer, doth in Addition, Substraction, and Alteration, differ from the Truth of the Hebrew in at least 200. places. (If 200. Corruptions were found in the Psalms only, and that by Protestants themselves, How many, think you, might be found from the beginning of Genesis, to the end of the Apocalyps, if examined by an Impartial and strict Examination?) And this they made the Ground of their Scruple, to make use of the Common-Prayer; remaining doubtful, Whether a Man may with a safe Conscience subscribe thereto: Then, they Writ and Publish'd a particular Treatise, Entituled, A Defence of the Ministers Reasons for refusal of Subscribing: The whole Argument and Scope whereof, is only concerning Mis-translating: Then, the Reader may see, in the beginning of the said Book, the Title of every Chapter (Twenty Six in all) pointing to the Mis-translations there handled in particular.*

*Mr. Carlile avouches, That the English Translators have deprav'd the Sence, obscure'd the Truth, and deceiv'd the Ignorant: That in many places they detort the Scriptures from the right Sence, and that they shew themselves to love Darknes more than Light; Falshood more than Truth: Which Dr. Reynolds objecting against the Church of England, Mr. Whitaker had no better Answer, than to say, What Mr. Carlile, with some others, has Written against some places Translated in our Bibles, makes nothing to the purpose; I have not laid otherwise, but that some things may be amended.*

Hope. in  
Concord.  
Discord. fol.  
138.  
In Respons. ad  
Defens. &  
Respons.  
Castal.  
In Test.  
1556. in  
Prefat. & in  
Annot. in  
Mat. 3. & 4.  
Luc. 1. Ad. 8.  
& 10. Cor. 1.  
\* In sua Trans-  
lat. Nov. Test.  
Part. 12.  
fol. 110.

\* In Test.  
Part. 20, 30,  
4, 64, 65, 66,  
74, 99. &  
Part. 8, 13,  
14, 21, 23.  
† In Defens.  
Translat. pag.  
170.  
See Lind.  
Dub. pag. 84,  
85, 96, 98.

Pet. directed  
to his Majesty  
pag. 75, 76.

That Christ  
descended in-  
to Hell, pag.  
116, 117, 118,  
121, 144.  
Whitak. r's  
Answ. to Dr.  
Reynolds. pag.  
255.

# The P R E F A C E.

See the Abridg'ment, which the Ministers of Lincoln Dioces deliver'd to his Majesty, pag. 11, 12, 13. Burges Apol. Sect. 6. and in Cover's Answ. to Burges, pag. 93. See the Triple Cord, pag. 147.

See the Conference before the King's Majesty, pag. 46, and 47. Apolog. concerning Christ's descent into Hell at Ddd.

Confer. before His Majesty, pag. 46.

Whitak. Answ. to D. Reynolds pag. 235.

Dr. Gregory Martin writ a whole Treate-  
tise against them.

Bishop Tunstal discover'd in Tindal's New Testament only, no less than 2000 Corruptions.

The Ministers of Lincoln Dioces could not forbear, in their great Zeal, to signify to the King, that the English Translation of the Bible, is a Translation, that takes away from the Text, that adds to the Text, and that (sometimes) to the changing or obscuring of the Meaning of the Holy Ghost; calling it yet further, A Translation which is Absurd and Senceless, perverting (in many places) the Meaning of the Holy Ghost.

For which Cause, Protestants of tender Consciences made great scruple of subscribing thereto: How shall I (says Mr. Burges) approve under my hand, a Translation which hath so many Omissions, many Additions, which sometimes obscures, sometimes perverts the Sence; being sometimes senceless, sometimes contrary?

This great Evil of corrupting the Scripture, being well consider'd by Mr. Broughton, one of the most Zealous sort of Protestants, obliged him to Write an Epistle to the Lords of the Council, desiring them with all speed to procure a New Translation: Because (says he) that which is now in England is full of Errors. And in his Advertisements of Corruptions, he tells the Bishops, That their publick Translation of Scriptures into English is such, as that it perverts the Text of the Old Testament in 848 places, and that it causes Millions of Millions to reject the New Testament, and to run to Eternal Flames. A most dreadful Saying, certainly, for all those who are forc'd to receive such a Translation for their Only Rule of Faith.

King James the First, thought the Geneva Translation to be the worst of all; and further affirm'd, That in the Marginal Notes annex'd to the Geneva Translation, some are very Partial, Untrue, Seditious, &c. Agreeable to this are also these words of Mr. Parkes to Dr. Willet. --- As for the Geneva Bibles, 'tis to be wish'd, that either they were Purg'd from those manifold Errors, which are both in the Text, and in the Margent, or else utterly prohibited.

Now, these our Protestant English Translations being thus confessedly Corrupt, Absurd, Senceless, Contrary, and perverting the meaning of the Holy Ghost; Had not King James the First just cause to affirm, That he could never yet see a Bible well Translated into English? And whether such falsly Translated Bibles ought to be imposed upon the Ignorant People, and by them receiv'd for the Very Word of God, and for their Only Rule of Faith, I refer to the Judgment of the World; and do freely assert with Dr. Whitaker, a Learned Protestant, That Translations are so far forth Only the Word of God, as they faithfully express the Meaning of the Authentical Text.

The English Protestant Translations having been thus Exclaim'd against, and Cry'd down not only by Catholicks, but even by the most Learned Protestants, as you have seen; It pleas'd his Majesty, King James the First, to Command a Review and Reformation of those Translations which had pass'd for God's Word in King Edward the Sixth, and Queen Elizabeth's days: Which Work was undertaken by the Prelatick Clergy, not so much (tis to be fear'd) for the Zeal of Truth, as appears by their having Corrected so very few places, as out of a design of Correcting some such faults as favour'd the more Puritanical part of Protestants (Presbyterians,) against the Usurped Authority, pretended Episcopacy, Ceremonies, and Traditions of the Prelatick Party. For Example, The word (Congregation) in their first Bibles, was the usual and only English word they made use of for the Greek and Latin word ἐκκλησία Ecclesia, because then the Name of Church was most Odious to them; Yet, they could not endure to hear any mention of a Church, because of the CATHOLICK CHURCH, which they had forsaken, and which withheld and condemn'd them. But now, being grown up to something (as themselves fancy) like a Church, they resolve in good earnest, to take upon them the Face, Figure, and Grandure of a Church; and to Censure, and Excommunicate, yea, and Persecute their Dissenting Brethren; rejecting therefore that humble

## The P R E F A C E.

bumble Appellation, which their Primitive Ancestors were content with, [viz. Congregation,] they assume the Title of Church, [the Church of England,] to Countenance which, they bring the Word [ Church ] again into their Translations, and Banish that their once Darling Congregation.

They have also, instead of Ordinances, Institutions, &c. been pleased in some places to Translate Traditions; thereby to vindicate several Ceremonies of Theirs against their Puritanical Brethren.

The word [Image] being so shameful a Corruption, they were pleas'd likewise to Correct, and instead thereof to Translate Idol, according to the True Greek and Latin; Let it appear that this was not amended out of any good Design, or love to Truth; but either merely out of Shame, or however to have it said that they had done something. Seeing they have not Corrected it in all places, especially in the Old-Testament, Exod. 20. where they yet read Image, [ Thou shalt not make to thy self any Graven Image,] The Word in Hebrew being Pesel, the very same that Sculptile is in Latin, and signifies in English a Graven or Carved Thing; and in the Greek 'tis Eidolon, [an Idol]: So that, by this False and Wicked Practice, they endeavour to discredit the Catholick Religion; and (contrary to their own Consciences, and Corrections in the New-Testament) endeavour to make the People believe, that Image and Idol are the same, and equally forbidden by Scripture, and GOD's Commandments; and consequently, that Popery is Idolatry, for admitting the due use of Images.

They have also Corrected that most Absurd and Shameful Corruption [Grave,] and, as they ought to do, have instead of it Translated [Hell]; so that now they read, Thou wilt not leave my Soul in Hell; whereas Beza has it, Thou wilt not leave my Carcass in the Grave. Let we see, that this is not out of any sincere Intention, or respect to Truth neither, because they have but Corrected it in some few places, not in all, (as you will see hereafter;) which they would not do, especially in Genesis, lest they should thereby be forc'd to admit of Limbus Patrum, where Jacob's Soul was to descend, when he said, I will go down to my Son into Hell, Mourning, &c. And to balance the Advantage they think they may have given Catholicks where they have Corrected it, they have (against Purgatory and Limbus Patrum) in another place most grossly Corrupted the Text: For whereas the words of our Saviour are, Quickned in Spirit (or Soul,) In the which Spirit coming, he Preached to them also that were in Prison; they translate, Quickned by the Spirit, by which also he went and Preached unto the Spirits in Prison. This was so notorious a Corruption, that Dr. Montague, afterwards Bishop of Chichester and Norwich, reprobated for it Sir Henry Savil, to whose Care the translating of St. Peter's Epistle was committed: But Sir Henry Savill told him plainly, That Dr. Abbot Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, and Dr. Smith Bishop of Gloucester, Corrupted and Altered the Translation of this place, which himself had sincerely performed.— Note here by the by, That if Dr. Abbot's Conscience could so lightly suffer him to Corrupt the Scripture, His [or his Servant Mason's] Forging the Lambeth-Records, could n't possibly cause the least Scruple, especially being a thing so highly for their Interest and Honour.

These are the chiefest Faults they have Corrected in this their New Translation; and with what sinister Designs they have amended them, appears visible enough; to wit, Either to keep their Authority and gain Credit for their New-thought-on Episcopall and Priestly Character and Ceremonies against Puritans or Presbyterians; or else, for very shame, urg'd thereto by the Exclamations of Catholicks; daily Inveighing against such intolerable Falsifications. But because they resolv'd not to Correct either All, or the Tenth part of the Corruptions of the former Translation; therefore, fearing their Over-seen Falsifications would be observ'd, both by Puritans and Catholicks, In their Epistle Dedicatory to the

<sup>1</sup> Peter 3. ver.  
18, 19.

## The P R E F A C E.

*King, they desire His Majesty's Protection, for that* On the one side, we shall be Traduc'd (say they) by Popish Persons at Home or Abroad, who therefore will Malign us, because we are poor Instruments to make GOD's Holy Truth to be yet more known unto the People, whom they desire still to keep in Ignorance and Darknes: On the other side, we shall be malign'd by self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, &c.

*We see how they endeavour here to perswade the King and the World, That Catholicks are desirous to conceal the Light of the Gospel: Whereas, on the contrary, nothing is more obvious, than the daily and Indefatigable Endeavours of Catholick Missioners and Priests, not only in Preaching and Explaining GGD's Holy Word in Europe; but also in forsaking their own Countries and Conveniences, and Travelling with great Difficulties and Dangers by Sea and Land, into Asia, Africa, America, and the Antipodes, with no other Design than to publish the Doctrine of Christ, and to discover and manifest the Light of the Gospel to Infidels, who are in Darknes and Ignorance. Nor do any but Catholicks stick to the Old Letter and Sense of Scripture, without Altering the Text, or rejecting any part thereof, or devising New Interpretations; which certainly cannot demonstrate a desire in them to keep People in Ignorance and Darknes. Indeed, as for their Self-conceited Presbyterian and Phanatick Brethren, who run their own Ways in Translating and Interpreting Scripture, we do not excuse them, but only say, That we see no reason why Prelaticks should reprobate them for a Fault, whereof themselves are no less Guilty. Do not themselves of the Church of England run their own Ways also, (as well as those other Sectaries) in Translating the Bible? Do they stick to either the Greek, Latin, or Hebrew Text? Do they not leap from one Langnage and Copy to another? Accept and Reject what they please? Do they not fancy a Sense of their Own, every whit as contrary to that of the Catholick and Ancient Church, as that of their Self-conceited Brethren the Presbyterians, and others is Acknowledg'd to be? And yet they are neither more Learned nor more Skilful in the Tongues, nor more Godly than those they so much Contemn and Blame.*

*All Hereticks that have ever warr'd War against God's Holy Church, what-ever particular Weapons they have had, have generally made use of these Two, viz. Misrepresenting and Ridiculing the Doctrine of God's Church: And, Corrupting and Misinterpreting His Sacred Word, the Holy Scripture. We find not any since Simon Magus's Days, that have ever been more dexterous and skilful in handling these direful Arms, than the Hereticks of our Times.*

*In the first place, They are so great Masters and Doctors in Misrepresenting, Mocking, and Deriding Religion, that they seem even to have solely Devoted themselves to no other Profession or Place, but Cathedræ Irresorum, the School or Chair of the Scorners, as David terms their Seat: Which the Holy Apostle St. Peter foresaw, when he foretold, that There should come in the latter Days, Illusores, SCOFFERS, walking after their own Lusts. To whom did this Prophesie ever better agree, than to the Hereticks of our Days, who deride the Sacred Scriptures? The Author of the Book of Ecclesiastes, (says one of them) had neither Boots nor Spurrs, but rid on a long Stick, in Begging Shoes: Who Scoff at the Book of Judith: Compare the Macchabees to Robin-hood, and Bevis of Southampton: Call Baruch, a peevish Ape of Jeremy: Count the Epistle to the Hebrews as Stubble: And deride St. James's, as an Epistle made of Straw: Contemn Three of the Four Gospels. What Ridiculing is this of the Word of God? Nor were the first Pretended Reformers only guilty of this, but the same Vein has still continu'd in the Writings, Preachings, and Teachings of their Successors; a great part of which, are nothing but a mere Mockery, Ridiculing, and Misrepresenting of the Doctrine of Christ, as is too notorious*

## The P R E F A C E.

and visible in the many scurrilous and scornful Writings and Sermons, lately publish'd by several Men of no small Figure in our English Protestant Church. By which Scoffing Stratagem, when they cannot LAUGH the Vulgar into a Contempt and Abhorrence of Christian Religion, They fly to their other Weapon, to wit, Imposing upon the Peoples weak Understanding, by a Corrupt, Imperfect, and False Translated Bible.

Dr. St. Dr. T.  
Dr. S. Dr. T.  
Mr. W. &c.

Tertullian complain'd thus of the Hereticks of his Time, *Ista Hærefis non recipit quasdam Scripturas, &c.* These Hereticks admit not some Books of Scriptures; and those which they do admit, by adding to, and taking from, they pervert to serve their purpose: And if they receive some Books, yet they receive them not entirely; or if they receive them entirely, after some sort, nevertheless they spoyl them by devising divers Interpretations. In this Case, What will you do, that think your selves skilful in Scriptures, when that which you defend, the Adversary denys; and that which you deny, he defends? *Et tu quidem nihil perdes nisi vocem de Contentione, nihil consequeris nisi bilis de Blasphematione:* And you indeed shall lose nothing but words in this Contentions; nor shall you gain any thing but Anger from his Blasphemy. How fitly may these words be apply'd to the pretended Reformers of our days, who, when told of their Abusing, Corrupting, and Mis-interpreting the Holy Scriptures, are so far from acknowledging their Faults, that on the contrary they blush not to defend them. When Mr. Martin, in his Discovery, told them of their Falsifications in the Bible, did they thank him for letting them see their Mistakes, (as indeed Men, endu'd with the Spirit of Sincerity and Honesty, would have done?) No, they were so far from that, that Fulk, as much as in him lies, endeavours very obstinately to defend them: And Whittaker affirms, That their Translations are well done, (*Why then were they afterwards Corrected?*) and that all the faults Mr. Martin finds in them, are but Trifles; demanding, what there is in their Bibles that can be found fault with, as not Translated well and truly? Such a Pertinacious, Obstinate, and Contentious Spirit, are Hereticks possest with, which indeed is the very thing that renders them Hereticks; for with such I do not rank those in the List, who, tho' they have ever with their first Milk (as I may say) imbib'd their Errors, and have been Educated from their Child-hood in Erroneous Opinions, yet do neither pertinaciously adhere to the same, nor obstinately resist the Truth, when propos'd to them; but, on the contrary, are willing to Imbrace it.

Whit. p. 24.

How many Innocent, and well-meaning People, are there in England, who have scarce in all their Life-time, ever heard any mention of a Catholick, or Catholick Religion, unless under these Monstrous and frightful Terms of Idolatry, Superstition, Antichristianism, &c? How many have ever heard a better Character of Catholicks, than Bloody-minded People, Thirsters after Blood, Worshippers of Wooden Gods, Prayers to Stocks and Stones, Idolaters, Anti-christs, The Beast in the Revelations, and what not that may render them more Odious than Hell, and more Frightful than the Devil himself, and that from the Mouths and Pens of their Teachers, and Ministerial Guides? Is it then to be wonder'd at, that these so grossly-deceiv'd people, should entertain a strange prejudice against Religion, and a Detestation of Catholicks?

Whereas, if these Blind-folded people were once undeceiv'd, and brought to understand, that all these Monstrous Scandals are falsly charg'd upon Catholicks; That Catholick Doctrine is so far from Idolatry, that it Teaches the quite contrary, viz. That whosoever gives God's Honour to Stocks and Stones, (as Protestants phrase it,) to Images, to Saints, to Angels, or to any Creature; yea, to any thing but to God himself, is an Idolater, and will be Damn'd for the same; That Catholicks are so far from thirsting after the Blood of others, that, on the contrary, their Doctrine teaches them, not only to love God above all, and their

## The P R E F A C E.

Neighbour as themselves, but even to love their Enemies. In short, So far different is the Roman Catholick Religion from what it is by Protestants Represented, that, on the contrary, Faith, Hope, and Charity, are the Three Divine Virtues it Teaches us: Prudence, Justice, Fortitude, and Temperance, are the Four Moral Virtues it exhorts us to: Which Christian Virtues, when it happens that they are, through Human Frailty, and the Temptations of our Three Enemies, the World, the Flesh, and the Devil, either Wounded or Lost; Then are we taught to apply our selves to such Divine Remedies, as our Blessed Saviour Christ has left us in his Church, viz. His Holy Sacraments, by which our Spiritual Infirmities are Cur'd and Repair'd. By the Sacrament of Baptism, We are Taught, That Original Sin is forgiven, and that the Party Baptiz'd is Regenerated, and Born a New unto the Mystical Body of Christ, of which by Baptism he is made a lively Member: So likewise by the Sacrament of Penance all our Actual Sins are forgiven; the same Holy Spirit of God working in this to the forgiveness of Actual Sin, that wrought before in the Sacrament of Baptism to the forgiveness of Original Sin. We are Taught likewise, That by partaking of Christ's very Body, and his very Blood, in the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, We by a perfect Union dwell in Him, and He in Us; and that as Himself rose again for our Justification, so we, at the Day of Judgment, shall in him receive a Glorious Resurrection, and Reign with Him for all Eternity, as Glorious Members of the same Body, whereof Himself is the Head. It further Teaches us, That none but a Priest, truly Consecrated by the Holy Sacrament of Order, can Consecrate and Administer the Holy Sacraments. —— This is our Religion, This is the Center it tends too, and the sole End it aims at; which point, we are further taught, can never be gain'd but by a True Faith, a Firm Hope, and a Perfect Charity.

To Conclude, If (I say) thousands of well-meaning Protestants understood this, as also that Protestantcy it self is nothing else but a meer Imposture begun in England, maintain'd and upheld by the Wicked Policy of Self-Interested Statesmen; and still continu'd by Mis-representing & Ridiculing the Catholick Religion, by Mis-interpreting the holy Scriptures; yea, by Falsifying, Abusing, and (as will appear in this following Treatise) by most Abominably Corrupting the Sacred Word of God: How far would it be from them Obstinate and Pertinaciously to adhere to the False and Erroneous Principles, in which they have hitherto been Educated? How willingly would they submit their Understandings to the Obedience of Faith? How earnestly would they Imbrace that Rule of Faith, which our Blessed Saviour, and his Apostles, left us for our Guide to Salvation? With what diligence would they bend all their Studies, to learn the most wholesome and saving Doctrine of God's Holy Church? In fine, If once Enlightned with a True Faith, and Encourag'd with a Firm Hope, What Zealous Endeavours would they not use to acquire such Virtues, and Christian Perfections, as might Enflame them with a Perfect Charity, which is the very Ultimate and highest Step to Eternal Felicity? To which God of his Infinite Goodness, and tender Mercy, through the Merits and Bitter Death and Passion of our Dear Saviour, Jesus Christ, bring us All. Amen.

THE  
TRUTH  
OF  
Protestant Translations  
OF THE  
BIBLE,  
EXAMINED.



UR Pretended Reformers, having Squar'd and Modell'd to themselves a FAITH, contrary to the certain and direct RULE of APOSTOLICAL TRADITION, deliver'd in God's Holy Church, were forc'd to have Recourse to the Scripture, as their ONLY RULE OF FAITH; according to which, the *Church of England* has, in the Sixth of her 39 Articles, declar'd, *That the Scripture comprehended in the Canonical Books (i. e. so many of them as She thinks fit to call so) of the Old and New Testament, is the Rule of Faith so far, that whatsoever is not Read therein, or cannot be prov'd thereby, is not to be accepted as any Point of Faith, or needful to be follow'd.* But finding themselves still at a loss, their New Doctrins being so far from being contain'd in the Holy Scripture, that they were directly opposite to it; they were fain to seek out to themselves many other Inventions; amongst which, none was more generally Practis'd, than the *Corrupting* of the Holy Scripture by *False and Partial Translations*; by which they Endeavour'd, Right or Wrong, to make those Sacred Volumes speak in Favour of their New-Invented Faith and Doctrine.

The Corruptions of this Nature, in the first *English* Protestant Translations, were so many, and so Notorious, that Dr. *Gregory Martin* composed a whole Book of them, in which he discovers the Fraudulent Shifts the Translators were fain to make use of, in defence of them. Sometimes they recurr'd to the *Hebrew* Text; and when That spoke against their New Doctrine, then to the *Greek*; when That favour'd them not, to some Copy acknowledg'd by themselves to be corrupted, and of no Credit: And when no Copy at all could be found out to cloak their Corruptions, then must the *Book or Chapter* of Scripture contradicting them, be declar'd *Apocryphal*: And when that cannot be made probable, they fall down-right upon the *Prophets* and *Apostles* that Writ them, saying, *That they might, and did ERR, even after the Coming of the Holy Ghost*. Thus *Luther*, accus'd by *Zuinglius* for Corrupting the Word of *God*, had no way left to defend his Impiety, but by Impudently preferring himself, and his own *Spirit*, before that of those who Writ the Holy Scriptures, saying, *Be it that the Church, Augustine, and other Doctors, also Peter and Paul, yea, an Angel from Heaven, Teach otherwise, yet is my Doctrine such as sets forth God's Glory, &c. Peter, the Chief of the Apostles, liv'd and taught (extra verbum Dei,) besides the Word of God.*

*Vid. Supr.*

*Tom. 5. Wit-  
tumb. fol. 2. o.  
& in Ep. ad  
Galat. cap. 1.*

*De Capt. Ba-  
bst. cap. de  
Extrem-unb.  
T. m. 2. Wit-  
tumb.*

*See the 5. cond  
D. serice of  
the Exposition  
of the Doct.  
of the Church  
of Engl. &c.*

*Cens. 1. l. 2.  
c. 10. col. 580.*

*Calvin in  
Gal. t. c. 2.  
v. 14. p. 511.*

*Lavater.  
in Histor.  
Sacrament.  
pag. 18.*

And against St. James's mentioning the Sacrament of *Extream Unction*: But tho' (says he) this were the Epistle of James, I would Answer, That it is not lawful for an *Apostle*, by his Authority, to Institute a Sacrament; this appertains to *Christ* alone. As tho' that Blessed Apostle would publish a Sacrament without Warrant from *Christ*! Our

Church of *England* Divines having unadvisedly put St. James's Epistle into the *Canon*, are forc'd, instead of such an Answer, to say, *That the Sacrament of Extream Unction was yet [viz. In the days of Gregory the Great,] Unborn*. As tho' the Apostle St. James had spoken he knew not what, when he Advis'd, That the Sick should be by the Priests of the Church, *Anointed with Oyl in the Name of our Lord*.

Nor was this *Luther*'s shift alone; for all Protestants follow their first pretended Reformer in this Point, being necessitated so to do for the Maintenance of their Reformations, and Translations, so directly opposite to the known Letter of the Scripture.

The *Magdeburgians* follow *Luther*, in accusing the Apostles of Error, particularly St. *Paul*, by the perswasion of *James*.

*Brentius* also (whom *Jewel* terms a Grave and Learned Father,) affirms, *That St. Peter, the Chief of the Apostles, and alio Barnabas, after the Holy Ghost receiv'd, together with the Church of Jerusalem, Err'd*.

*John Calvin* affirms, *That Peter added to the Schism of the Church, to the endangering of Christian Liberty, and the overthrow of the Grace of Christ*: And in pag. 150. he reprehends *Peter* and *Barnabas*, and others.

*Zanchius* mentions some *Calvinists* in his Epist. *ad Misc.* who said, *If Paul should come to Geneva, and Preach the same bear with Calvin, they would leave Paul, and bear Calvin*.

And *Lavatherus* affirms, *That some of Luther's Followers, not the meanest among their Doctors, said, They had rather doubt of St. Paul's Doctrine, than the Doctrine of Luther, or of the Confession of Augsbourg*.

This desperate Shift being so necessary for warranting their Corruptions of Scripture, and maintaining the *Fallibility* of the Church in succeeding Ages, (for the same reasons which conclude it *Infallible in the Apostles time*, are applicable to ours, and to every former Century; otherwise it must be said, that *God's Providence and Promises were limited to few years, and Himself so Partial, but he regards not the necessities of his Church, nor the salvation of any person that liv'd after the time of his Disciples*;) the Church of *England* could

could not reject it without contradicting their Brethren abroad, and their own Principles at home. Therefore Mr. Jewel, in his Defence of the Apology for the Church of *England*, affirms, That St. Mark mistook *Abiathar* for *Abimelech*; and St. Matthew, *Hieremias* for *Zacharias*. And Mr. Fulk against the *Rhemish Testament*, in Galat. 2. fol. 322. charges Peter with Error of Ignorance against the Gospel.

Pag. 361.

Dr. Goad, in his four Disputations with F. Campion, affirms, That St. Peter err'd in Faith, and that, after the sending down of the Holy Ghost upon them. And Whitaker says, 'Tis evident, that even after Christ's Ascension, and the Holy Ghost's descending upon the Apostles, the whole Church, not only the common sort of Christians, but also even the Apostles themselves, Erred in the Vocation of the Gentiles, &c. Yea, Peter also Err'd. He furthermore Err'd in Manners, &c. And these were great Errors; and yet we see these to have been in the Apostles, even after the Holy Ghost descended upon them.

The Second  
days Confe-  
rence.  
VVhitaker de  
Eccles. contr.  
Bellar. Con-  
trovers. 2. q.  
4. p. 223.

Thus these Fallible Reformers, who, to Countenance their Corruptions of Scripture, Grace their own Errors, and Authorize their Churches Fallibility, would make the Apostles themselves Fallible; but indeed, they need not to have gone this bold way to work, for we are satisfied, and can very easily believe their Church to be Fallible, their Doctrines Erroneous, and themselves Corrupters of the Scriptures, without being forc'd to hold, that the Apostles Err'd.

Protestants to  
Authorize  
their own Er-  
rors and Fal-  
libility, would  
make the A-  
postles them-  
selves Erroni-  
ous and Falli-  
ble.

And truly, if (as they say) the Apostles were not only Fallible, but taught Errors in Manners, and Matters of Faith, after the Holy Ghost's descending upon them, their Writings can be no Infallible Rule, (or, as themselves Term it, Perfect Rule of Faith,) to direct Men to Salvation: Which Conclusion is so immediately and clearly deduc'd from this Protestant Doctrine, that the Supposal and Premises once granted, there can be no certainty in the SCRI P T U R E it self. And indeed, this (we see) all the pretended Reformers aim'd at, tho' they durst not say so much, and we shall in this little Tract make it most evidently appear from their intolerable abusing it, how little esteem and slight regard they have for the *Sacred Scripture*; tho' they make their ignorant Flocks believe, that, as they have Translated it, and deliver'd it to them, it is the Pure and Infallible Word of God.

Before I come to particular Examples of their Falsifications and Corruptions, let me Advertise my Reader, That my Intention is to make use only of such *English* Translations, as are common, and well known in *England* even to this day, as being yet in many Mens hands; to wit, Those Bibles Printed in the Years 1562, 1577, and 1579, in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign; which I will confront with their last Translation made in King James the first Reign, from the Impression Printed at *London* in the Year 1683.

In all which said Bibles, I shall take notice sometimes of one Translation, sometimes of another, as every ones Falshood shall give occasion: Neither is it a good Defence for the Falshood of one, that it is truly Translated in another, the Reader being deceiv'd by any one, because commonly he reads but one; yea, one of them is a *Condemnation* of the other. And where the *English* Corruptions, here noted, are not to be found in one of the first three Bibles, let the Reader look in another of them; for if he find not the Falsification in *All*, he will certainly find it in *Two*, or at least *One* of them: And in this Case, I advertise the Reader to be very circumspect, that he think not, by and by these are falsely Charged, because there may be found perhaps some later Edition, wherein the same Error we Noted, may be Corrected; For 'tis their common and known Fashion, not only in their Translations of the Bible, but in their other Books and Writings, to

Bib. 1562;  
77, & 79.

alter and change, add and put out, in their later Editions, according as either themselves are ashamed of the former, or their Scholars that Print them again, *Dissent* or *Dis-agree* from their Masters.

Note also, That tho' I do not so much charge them with falsifying the *Vulgar Latin Bible*, which has always been of so great Authority in the Church of God, and with all the \* Antient Fathers, as *I do the Greek*, which they pretend to Translate: I cannot however but observe, That as *Luther* wilfully forsook the Latin Text in favour of his Heresies and Erroneous Doctrines; so the rest follow his Example even to this day for no other cause in the World, but that it makes against their *Errors*.

For Testimony of which, what greater Argument can there be than this, That *Luther*, who before had always Read with the Catholick Church, and with all Antiquity, these words of St. Paul, *Have not we Power to lead about a Woman, a Sister, as also the rest of the Apostles?* And in St. Peter these words, *Labour that by Good Works, you may make sure your Vocation and Election:* Suddenly after he had, contrary to his Profession, taken a *Wife*, (as he call'd her) and Preach'd, that all other Votaries might do the same: That *Faith alone Justify'd*, and that *Good Works were not necessary to Salvation*: Immediately (I say) after he fell into these Heresies, he began to Read and Translate the former Texts of Scripture accordingly, in this manner, —— *Have not we Power to lead about a Sister, a Wife, as the rest of the Apostles?* And, *Labour that you may make sure your Vocation and Election*; leaving out the other words [*By Good Works.*] And so do both the *Calvinists* abroad, and our *English* Protestants at home, Read and Translate even to this day, because they hold the self-same *Errors*.

I would gladly know of our *English* Protestant Translators, Whether they Reject the *Vulgar Latin Text*, (so generally lik'd and approv'd by all the Primitive Fathers) purely out of design to furnish us with a more sincere and simple Version into *English* from the *Greek*, than they thought they could do from the *Vulgar Latin*? If so, Why do they not stick close to the *Greek Copy*, which they pretend to Translate, but (besides their Corrupting of it) fly from it, and have recourse again to the *Vulgar Latin*, when ever it may seem to make more for their purpose: Whence may be easily gather'd, that their pretending to Translate the *Greek Copy* was not of any good and candid Design, but rather, because they knew it was not so easie a matter for the Ignorant to discover their false Dealings from it as from the *Latin*; and also, because they might have the fairer pretence for their turning and winding too and fro from the *Greek* to the *Latin*, and then again to the *Greek*, according as they should judge most advantageous to them. It was also no little part of their Design, *To lessen the Credit and Authority of the Vulgar Latin Translation*, which had so long, and with so general a consent been receiv'd and approv'd in the Church of God, and Authoriz'd by the General Council of *Trent*, for the only best, and most Authentick Text.

Because therefore I find they will scarce be able to justify their rejecting the *Latin Translation*, unless they had dealt more sincerely with the *Greek*, I have, in this following Work, set down the *Latin Text*, (as well as the *Greek* word whereon their Corruption depends;) yet, where they truly keep to the *Greek* and *Hebrew*, which they profess to follow, and which they will have to be the most *Authentick Text*, I do not charge them with Heretical Corruptions.

The Left-hand Page I have divided into four Columns, (besides the Margent, in which I have noted the *Bo.k*, *Chapter*, and *Verse*.) In the First I have set down the Text of Scripture from the *Vulgar Latin Edition*, putting the Word that their *English Bibles* have Corrupted in a *different Charakter*; to which I have also added the *Greek* and

\* See the Preface of the Rhemes New Testament.

1 Cor. 9. v. 5.  
Mulierem  
Sororem.  
2 Pet. 1. ver.  
10. Ut per  
bona opera  
certam vestram  
vocationem &  
electionem  
faciat.

and Hebrew words, so often as they are, or may be necessary for the better understanding of the word on which the Stress lies in the Corrupt Translation.

In the Second Column I have given you the true *English* Text from the *Roman Catholic* Translation, made by the Divines of *Rhemes* and *Doway*; which is done so faithfully and candidly from the Authentick *Vulgar Latin* Copy, that the most Carping and Critical Adversary in the World cannot accuse it of Partiality or Design, contrary to the very true Meaning and Interpretation thereof. As for the *English* of the said *Rhemes* Translation, which is Old, and therefore must needs differ much from the more refin'd *English* spoken at this day, the Reader ought to consider, not only the place where 'twas Writ, but also the time since which the Translation was made, and then he will find the less fault with it. For my part, because I have referr'd my Reader to the said Translation made at *Rhemes*, I have not alter'd one syllable of the *English*, though indeed I might in some places have made the word more agreeable to the Language of our Times.

In the Third Column you have the Corruption, and False Translation, from those Bibles that were set forth in *English* at the beginning of that most miserable Revolt and Apostacy from the *Catholick Church*, viz. from that Bible which was Translated in King *Edward the Sixth's* Time, and Reprinted in the Year 1562, and from the two next Impressions, made *Anno 1577*, and *1579*. All which were Authoriz'd in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, when the Church of *England* began to get Footing, and to Exercise Dominion over her Fellow-Sectaries, as well as to Tyrannize over *Catholicks*: whence it cannot be deny'd, but those Bibles were wholly agreeable to the Principles and Doctrine of the said Church of *England* in those days, however they pretend at this day to Correct or Alter them.

In the Fourth Column, you find one of the last Impressions of their *Protestant Bible*, viz. That Printed at *London* by the Assigns of *John Bill* Deceased, and by *Henry Hills* and *Thomas Newcomb*, Printers to the Kings most Excellent Majesty, *Anno Dom. 1683*. — In which Bible, where-ever I find them to have Corrected and Amended the place Corrupted in their former Translations, I have put down the word [*Corrected*;] but where the Falsification is not yet Rectified, I have set down likewise the Corruption: And that indeed is in most places, yea, and in some two or three places, they have made it rather worse than better: And this indeed gives me great reason to suspect, that in those few places, where the Errors of the former *False Translations* have been Corrected in the latter, it has not always been the Effect of Plain-dealing and Sincerity; for if such Candid Intention of amending former Faults had every-where prevail'd with them, they would not in any place have made it worse, but would also have Corrected all the rest, as well as one or two, that are not now so much to their purpose, as they were at their first Rising.

In the Right-hand Page of this Treatise, I have set down the Motives and Inducments, that (as we may reasonably presume) prompted them to Corrupt and Falsifie the Sacred Text, with some short Arguments here and there against their Unwarrantable Proceedings.

All which I have contriv'd in as short and compendious a Method as I possibly could, knowing that there are many, who are either not able, or at least not willing to go to the Price of a great Volume. And because my desire is to be Beneficial to *All*, I have accommodated it not only to the *Parce* of the *Poore*, but also (as near as possible) to the *Capacity* of the most *Ignorant*; For which Reasons also, I have past by a great many Learned Arguments brought by my Author, from the *Significations*, *Etymologies*, *Derivations*,

<sup>4</sup> Dr. Martin.

vations, Usages, &c. of the Greek and Hebrew words, as also from the comparing of places Corrupted, with other places rightly Translated from the *same Word*, in the *same Translation*; with several other things, whereby he largely Confutes their insincere and disingenuous Proceedings: These, I say, I have omitted, not only for *brevity sake*, but also as things that could not be of any *great benefit* to the Simple and Unlearned Reader.

As for others *more Learned*, I will refer them to the Work it self, that I have made use of through this whole Treatise, *viz.* To that most *Elaborate* and *Learned Work* of Mr. *Gregory Martin*, Entituled, *A Discovery of the manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures, &c.* Printed at *Rhemes*, Anno 1582. which is not hard to be found.

Have we not great Cause to Believe, that our Protestant Divines do obstinately teach contrary to their own Consciences? For, (besides their having been reprov'd, without amendment, for their Impious handling the Holy Scripture,) if their Learning be so *Profound* and *Bottomless*, as themselves proudly boast in all their Works, we cannot but conclude, that they must needs both *See* their *Errors*, and *know* the *Truth*. And therefore, tho' we cannot always cry out of them, and their Followers, [*The Blind lead the Blind.*] yet, which is Alas! a thousand times more miserable, we may justly Exclaim, [*Those who SEE, lead the Blind*, till with themselves they fall into the Ditch!]

As nothing has ever been worse resented by such as forsake God's Holy Church, than to hear themselves branded with the general Title of *Hereticks*; so nothing has been ever more common among *Catholicks*, than justly to Stigmatize such with the same Infamous *Character*. I am not Ignorant, how ill the *Protestants* of our days resent this *Terror*, and therefore do avoid, as much as the Nature of this Work will permit, the giving them the least disgust by this horrid Appellation: Nevertheless I must needs give them to understand, that the Nature of the Holy Scripture is such, that whosoever do voluntarily Corrupt and Pervert it, to Maintain their own Erroneous Doctrines, cannot lightly be Character'd by a less Infamous Title, than that of **HERETICKS**; and their false Versions, by the Title of **HERETICAL TRANSLATIONS**, under which Denomination I have plac'd these following Corruptions.

Notwithstanding, I would have the *Protestant Reader* to take Notice, that I neither *Name* nor *Judge* all to be *Hereticks* (as is hinted in my *Preface*,) who hold Errors contradictory to God's Church, but such as pertinaciously persist in their Errors.

So proper and Essential is *Pertinacy* to the Nature of *Heresie*, that if a Man should hold or Believe never so many false Opinions against the Truth of *Christian Faith*, but yet not with *Obstinacy* and *Pertinacy*, he should *ERR*, but not be an *Heretick*. Saint *Augustin* asserting, *That if any do defend their Opinions, tho' False and Perverse, with no Obsolete Animosity, but rather with all Solicitude do seek the Truth, and are ready to be Corrected when they find the same, These Men are not to be accounted for Hereticks, because they have not any Election of their own that contradicts the Doctrine of the Church.* And in another place, against the *Donatists*: *Let us (says he) suppose some Man to hold that of Christ at this Day, which the Heretick Photinus did, to wit, That Christ was only Man, and not God, and that he should think this to be the Catholick Faith; I will not say that he is an Heretick, unless when the Doctrine of the Church is made manifest unto him, he will rather chuse to hold that which he held before, than yield thereunto.*

S. Aug. Ep.  
162.

lib. 4. centr.  
Donat. c. 6.

De Civit. Dei  
lib. 18. c. 51.

*I* ga *o*, *Those*, says he, *who in the Church of CHRIST, hold Infectious and Perverse Doctrine, if when they are Corrected for it, they resist Stubbornly, and will not amend their pestilent and deadly Persuasion, but persist to defend the same, THESE MEN ARE MADE*

**MADE HERETICKS :** By all which places of St. *Augustin*, we see, that *ERROR* without *PERTINACT*, and *Obstinacy* against *GOD's Church* is no *Heresie*: It would be well therefore, if *Protestants*, in reading *Catholick Books*, would endeavour rather to inform themselves of the *TRUTH* of *Catholick Doctrine*, and humbly embrace the same, than to suffer that *Prejudice against Religion*, in which they have unhappily been educated, so strongly to *Byass* them, as to turn them from *Men barely Educated in Error*, to *Obstinate Hereticks*; such as the more harden their own Hearts, by how much the more clearly the *Doctrine* of *GOD's Holy Church* is demonstrated to them. When the *True Faith* is once made known to Men, *Ignorance* can no longer secure them from that *Eternal Punishment* to which *Heresie* undoubtedly hurries them: St. *Paul*, in his Epistle to *Titus*, affirming, *That a Man that is an Heretick, after the first and second Admonition, is Subverted, and Sinneth, being condemn'd of his own Judgment.*

What-ever may be said therefore, to excuse the *Ignorant*, and such as are not *Obstinate*, from that *Ignominious Character*; yet as for other, especially the *Leaders* of these misguided People, they will scarce be able to free themselves either from it, or escape the Punishment due to such, so long as they thus wilfully demonstrate their *Pertinacy*, not only in their *Obstinately* defending their *Erroneous Doctrines* in their *Disputes*, *Sermons*, and *Writings*; but even in *Corrupting* the *Word of GOD*, to force that *Sacred Book* to defend the same, and compel that *Divine Volume* to speak against such Points of *Catholick Doctrine* as themselves are pleas'd to deny.

In what can an *Heretical Intention* more evidently appear, than in *falsly Translating* and *Corrupting* the *Holy Bible*, against the *Catholick Church*, and such *Doctrines* as it has by an *uninterrupted Tradition*, brought down to us from the *Apostles*? As for Example :

*Against the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar.*

*Against the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist.*

*Against Priests, and the Power of Priesthood.*

*Against the Authority of Bishops.*

*Against the Sacred Altar on which Christ's Body and Blood is Offer'd.*

*Against the Sacrament of Baptism.*

*Against the Sacrament of Penance, and Confession of Sins.*

*Against the Sacrament of Marriage.*

*Against Intercession of Saints.*

*Against Sacred Images.*

*Against Purgatory, Limbus Patrum, and Christ's Descent into Hell.*

*Against Justification, and the possibility of Keeping GOD's Commandments.*

*Against Meritorious Works, and the Reward due to the same.*

*Against Free-Will.*

*Against True Inherent Justice, and in defence of their own Doctrine, that Only Faith is sufficient to Salvation.*

*Against Apostolical Traditions.*

*Titus cap. 1. ver. 10.*

Yea, against several other *Doctrines* of *GOD's Holy Church*, and in defence of divers *strange Opinions* of their own, which the *Reader* will find taken notice of in this *Treatise*: All which, when the unprejudic'd, and well-meaning *Protestant Reader* has consider'd, I am confident he will be struck with *Amazement*, and even *terrify'd* to look upon such *abominable Corruptions*!

Doubtless the generality of *Protestants* have hitherto been Ignorant ( and more's the pity ) of this ill-handling of the *Bible* by their *Translators*: Nor have, I am confident, their *Ministerial Guides* ever yet dealt so Ingenuously by them, as to tell them that *such and such a Text of Scripture* is translated *thus* and *thus*, contrary to the true *Greek*, *Hebrew*, or Ancient *Latin Copies on Purpose*, and to the *only Intent*, to make it speak against *such and such points of Catholick Doctrine*, and in favour of *this or that New Opinion* of their *Own*.

Does it appear to be done of *Negligence*, *Ignorance*, or *Mistake* ( as perhaps they would be willing to have the *Reader* believe ) or rather *Designedly* and *Wilfully*, when what they in some places translate *Truly*, in places of *Controversie*, between *Them* and *Us*, they grossly *Falsify*, in favour of their *Errors*?

Is it not a certain Argument of a *wilful Corruption*, where they deviate from that *Text*, and *Ancient Reading*, which has been us'd by all the *Fathers*; and instead thereof, to make the *Exposition* or *Commentary* of some *One Doctor*, the *very Text of Scripture* it self?

So also when in their *Translations* they fly from the *Hebrew* or *Greek* to the *Vulgar Latin*, where those *Originals* make against them, or not so much for their *purpose*, it is a manifest sign of *wilful Partiality*: And this they frequently do.

What is it else but *wilful Partiality*, when in *Words* of ambiguous and divers significations, they will have it signify *here* or *there*, as pleases themselves? So that in this place it must signify *thus*, in that place, not *thus*; As *Beza*, and one of their *English Bibles* ( for Example ) urge the *Greek word* [γυναικα] to signify *Wife*, and not to signify *Wife*, both against the *Virginity* and *Chastity* of *Priests*.

What is it but a voluntary and designed contrivance, when in a *case* That makes for them, they strain the *very Original signification* of the *Word*; and in the *contrary Case*, neglect it altogether? Yet this they do.

That their *Corruptions* are voluntary and designedly done, is evident in such places where *Passives* are turn'd into *Actives*, and *Actives* into *Passives*; where *Participles* are made to disagree in *Case* from their *Substantives*; where *Solacisms* are imagin'd when the *Construction* is most agreeable; and *Errors* pretended to creep out of the *Margent* into the *Text*: But *Beza* made use of all these, and more such like *Querks*.

Another note of *wilful Corruption* is, when they do not translate alike such words as are of like *Form* and *Force*: Example, if *Ulcerosus* be read *Full of Sores*, why must not *Gratiosa* be translated *Full of Grace*?

When the words, *Images*, *Shrines*, *Procession*, *Devotions*, *Excommunications*, &c. are us'd in ill part, where they are not in the *Original Text*; and the words *Hymns*, *Grace*, *Mystery*, *Sacrament*, *Church*, *Altar*, *Priest*, *Catholick*, *Justification*, *Tradition*, &c. avoided and suppress'd, where they are in the *Original*, as if no such *Words* were in the *Text*: Is it not an apparent token of *Design*, and that it is done purposely to disgrace or supress the *said Things* and *Speeches*?

Tho' *Beza* and *Whitaker* made it a *Good Rule* to translate according to the *Usual Signification*, and not the *Original Derivation* of *Words*; yet, contrary to this *Rule*, they translate *Idolum*, an *Image*; *Presbyter*, an *Elder*; *Diaconus*, a *Minister*; *Episcopus*, an *Overseer*, &c. Who sees not therefore but this is *wilful Partiality*?

If where the *Apostle* names a *Pagan Idolater*, and a *Christian Idolater*, by one and the same *Greek Word*, in one and the same *Meaning*; and they translate the *Pagan*, [ *Idolater*; ] and the *Christian*, [ *Worshipper of Images*, ] by two distinct *Words*, and in two divers *Meanings*, it must needs be *wilfully done*.

- No less appears it to be designedly done, to translate one and the same Greek word [μετάδοσις] *Tradition*, whensoever it may be taken for *Evil Traditions*; and never so, when it is spoken of *Good and Apostolical Traditions*.

So likewise when they foist into their Translation the word *Tradition*, taken in ill part, where it is not in the *Greek*; and omit it where it is in the *Greek*, when taken in good Part; 'tis certainly a most wilful Corruption.

At their first Revolt, when none were noted for *Schismaticks* and *Hereticks* but Themselves, they translated *Division* and *Sect*, instead of *Schism* and *Heresy*; and for *Heretick*, translated *An Author of Sects*: This cannot be excus'd of voluntary Corruption.

But why should I multiply Examples, when 'tis evident from their own Confessions and Acknowledgments? For instance, Concerning *μισericordia*, which the Vulgar Latin and Erasmus Translate, *Agere Pænitentiam*, Do Penance: *This Interpretation* (says Beza) *I refuse for many Causes*; but for this especially, *That many Ignorant Persons have taken hereby an Occasion of the false Opinions of SATISFACTION*, where-with the *Church is troubled at this Day*.

Many other ways there are, to make most certain Proofs of their Wilfulness; as when the *Translation* is fram'd according to their *False and Heretical Commentary*; and when they will avouch their *Translations* out of Prophane Writers, as *Homer*, *Plutarch*, *Pliny*, *Tully*, *Virgil*, and *Terence*, and Reject the Ecclesiastical Use of Words in the *Scriptures* and *Fathers*; which is Beza's usual Custom, whom our *English Translators* follow. But to note all their Marks were too tedious a Work, neither is it in this Place necessary: These are sufficient to satisfy the Impartial Reader, that All those *Corruptions* and *Falsifications* were not committed either through Negligence, Ignorance, Over-sight, or Mistake, as perhaps they will be glad to pretend; but *Designedly, Wilfully*, and of a *Malitious Purpose and Intention*, to Disgrace, Dishonour, Condemn, and Suppress the *Churches Catholick* and *Apostolick Doctrines* and *Principles*; and to Favor, Defend, and Bolster-up their own *New-devis'd Errors*, and *Monstrous Opinions*. And Beza is not far from confessing thus much, when against *Castilio* he thus complains: *The Matter* (says he) *is now come to this Point*, that the *Translators of Scripture out of the Greek into Latin, or into any other Tongue, think that they may lawfully do any thing in Translating*; whom if a Man reprehend, he shall be answer'd by and by, *That they do the Office of a Translator, not that Translates Word for Word, but that expresses the Sense: So it comes to pass, that whilst every Man will rather freely follow his own Judgment, than be a Religious Interpreter of the Holy Ghost, he rather Perverts many things, than Translates them.* This is spoken well enough, if he had done accordingly. But doing the quite contrary, Is he not a *Dissembling Hypocrite* in so saying, and a *Wilful Heretick* in so doing?

Our Quarrel with *Protestant* *Translators* is not for trivial or slight Faults, or for such verbal Differences, or little Escapes as may happen through the scarce-unavoidable Mistakes of the *Transcribers* or *Printers*: No! we accuse them of *Wilfully Corrupting* and *Falsifying* the *Sacred Text*, against Points of *FAITH* and *MANNERS*.

We deny not but several immaterial Faults and Depravations may enter a *Translation*, nor do we pretend that the *Vulgata* it self was free from such, before the Correction of *Sixtus V.* and *Clement VIII.* which through the Mistakes of *Printers*, and, before *Printing*, of *Transcribers*, happen'd to several Copies: So that a great many verbal Differences, and lesser Faults were by Learned Men discover'd in different Copies: (Not that any material Corruption in points of *Faith* were found in all Copies; for such God

Almighty's Providence, as *Protestants* themselves confess, would never suffer to enter : And indeed these lesser Depravations are not easily avoided, especially after several Transcriptions of Copies and Impressions from the Original, as we daily see in other Books.

To amend and rectifie such, The Church ( as you may read in the Preface to the *Sixtine* Edition ) has us'd the greatest Industry imaginable. Pope *Pius IV.* caus'd not only the Original Languages, but other Copies to be carefully examin'd : *Pius V.* Prosecuted that Laborious Work : And by *Sixtus V.* it was finish'd ; who commanded it to be put to the Pres'ls, as appears by his *Bull*, which begins, *Eternus ille Cœlestium, &c.* *Anno 1585.* Yet, notwithstanding the *Bull* prefixt before his *Bible* ( then Printed ) the same Pope *Sixtus* ( as is seen in the *Preface* made *Anno 1592.* ) after diligent Examination, found no few Faults slipt into his Impression, by the Negligence of the Printers : And therefore, *Censuit atque Decrevit*, both *Judg'd* and *Decreed* to have the whole Work *Examin'd* and *Reprinted* ; but that second Correction being prevented by his Death, was ( after the very short Reign of Three other *Popes* ) undertaken, and happily finish'd by his Successor *Clement VIII.* answerable to the Desire and absolute Intention of his Predecessor, *Sixtus* : Whence it is, that the *Vulgata* now extant, is call'd the Correction of *Sixtus*, because this Vigilant Pope, notwithstanding the endeavours of his Two Predecessors, is said to have begun it, which was according to his desire *Recogniz'd* and *Perfected* by *Clement VIII.* and therefore is not undeservedly call'd also the *Clementine Bible* : So that Pope *Sixtus*'s *Bible*, after *Clement*'s Recognition, is now Read in the *Church*, as *Authentick True Scripture* ; and is the very best Corrected Copy in the *Latin Vulgata*.

And whereas, Pope *Sixtus*'s *Bull* enjoyn'd that his *Bible* be read in all Churches, without the least Alteration ; yet this Injunction suppos'd the *Interpreters* and *Printers* to have done exactly their Duty every way, which was found wanting upon a second review of the whole Work. Such Commands and Injunctions therefore, where new difficulties arise ( not thought of before ) are not like Definitions of *Faith*, *unalterable*, but may and ought to be chang'd according to the Legislator's Prudence. What I say here is indisputable ; for how could Pope *Sixtus*, after a sight of such Faults as caus'd him to Intend another Impression, enjoyn no Alteration, when he desir'd One, which his Successor did for him : So that if Pope *Sixtus* had liv'd longer, he would as well have chang'd the *Breve*, as amended his Impression.

And whereas there were sundry different *Lections* of the *Vulgar Latin*, before the said Correction of *Sixtus* and *Clement*, the worthy Doctors of *Lovain*, with an Immense Labour, plac'd in the Margent of their *Bible* these different *Lections* of *Scripture* ; not determining which Reading was best, or to be preferr'd before others ; as knowing well, that the decision of such Causes belongs to the publick Judicature and Authority of the *Church*. Pope *Clement* therefore omitting no Humane Diligence, compar'd *Lection* with *Lection* ; and after mature weighing all, preferr'd that which was most agreeable to the Ancient Copies, a thing necessary to be done for the procuring One Uniform *Lection* of *Scripture* in the *Church*, approv'd on by the See Apostolick.--- And from this arises that Vilanous Calumny and open Slander of Dr. *Stillingfleet* ; who affirms, *That the Pope took where he pleas'd the Marginal Annotations in the Lovain Bible, and Inserted them into the Text* : Whereas ( I say ) he took not the *Annotations* or *Commentaries* of the *Lovain Doctors*, but the *different Readings* of *Scripture* found in several Copies.

Mr. James makes a great deal of *Noise* with his Impertinent Comparisons between these Two Editions, and that of *Lovain*: Yet among all his *Differences* he finds not One *Contrariety* in any material point of *Faith* or *Manners*: And as for other *Differences*, such as touch not *Faith* and *Religion*, arising from the *Expressions*, being longer or shorter, less *clear* in the One, and more *significant* in the Other; or happening thro' the Negligence of *Printers*, they give him no manner of ground for his *vain Cavils*; especially seeing (I say) the *Lovain* Bible gave the different Readings, without determining which was to be preferr'd; and what *Faults* were slipt into the *Sixtine* Edition were by him *Observ'd*, and a Second *Correction* design'd; which in the *Clementine* Edition was Perfected, and one Uniform *Reading* approv'd on.

Against *Thomas James's* Comparisons, read the Learned *James Gretser*, who sufficiently discovers his Untruths, with a *Mentito tertio Thomas James decem milia verborum*, &c. after which, Judge whether he hits every thing he says; and whether the *Vulgar Latin* is to be *Corrected* by the *Lovain Annotations*, or these by the *Vulgar*, if any thing were amiss in either? In fine, whether, If Mr. James's pretended *Differences* arise from comparing *All* with the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Caldee*, Must we needs suppose him to know the *last Energy* and force of every *Hebrew*, *Greek*, or *Caldee* Word (when there's *Controversie*) better than the *Authors* of the *Lovain*, and *Correctors* of the *Vulgar Latin* [the *Sixtine-Clementine* Edition.] Again, Let us demand of him, Whether all his *Differences* imply any material Alteration in *Faith* or *Manners*, or Introduce any notable *Error*, contrary to *GOD's Revealed Verities*: or are rather meer verbal *Differences*, grounded on the obscure signification of *Original Words*. In fine, if he, or any for him, plead any material Alteration, let them name any *Authentick Copy*, either *Original* or *Translation*; by the indisputable Integrity whereof these supposed *Errors* may be *Cancell'd*, and *GOD's pure Reveald Verities* put in their place. But to do this, after so Immense Labour and Diligence us'd in the *Correction* of the *Vulgar*, will prove a desperate Impossibility.

Indeed Mr. James might have had just cause to exclaim if he had found in these Bibles such Corruptions, as the *Protestant* Apostle, *Martin Luther*, wilfully makes in his *Translations*: As when he adds the word [*A L O N E*] to the *Text*, to maintain his *Heresie* of *Faith alone Justifying*; and omits that *Verse*, [*But if you do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in Heaven, forgive your Sins*:] He also omits these words, [*That you abstain from Fornication*:] And because the word *Trinity* sounded coldly with him, he left out this *Sentence*, which is the only *Text* in the *Bible* that can be brought to prove that Great *Mystery*, [*There are Three who bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One*.] Or if Mr. James had found such gross Corruptions, as that of *Zwinglius*, when instead of our Blessed Saviours positive words, [*This is my Body*,] he translates, *This is a Sign of my Body*, to avoid the *Doctrine of the Real Presence*; or such as are hereafter discover'd in *Protestant English Translations*: If, I say, he had met with such *wilful* and *abominable Corruptions* as these, he might have had good cause of Complaint: But seeing the most, he can make of all his painful Comparisons, comes but to this, *viz.* That he notes such *Faults*, as *Sixtus* himself *observ'd*, after the *Impression* was finish'd, and as *Clement Rectify'd*: I think he might have better employ'd his *Time* in *Correcting* the gross, and most intollerable Corruptions of the *Protestant Translation*, than to have busied himself about so unnecessary a *Work*: But there are a certain sort of Men, that had rather employ themselves in discovering *imaginary Moles* in their *Neighbours Eyes*, than in clearing their own from *real Beams*.

See the Preface to *Sixtus V. Edit. Antwerp. 1599. And Bib. max. Sept. 19. 20. Serarius c. 19.*

*Rom. 3. : 28.*

*Mark 11. : 26.*

*1 Thes. 4. : 4.*

*1 John 5. : 7.*

We must of necessity know the True Church, before we be certain either which is True Scripture, or which is the True sense of Scripture; Or by whom Spirit is is to be Expounded. And whether that CHURCH which has contain'd Visible in the World from Christ's Time till this day, Or that which was never known or heard of in the World till 1500 Years after our Saviour, is the True Church, let the World judge.

To conclude this Point, No Man can be certainly assured of true Scripture, unless he first come to a Certainty of a True Church, independently of Scripture: Find out therefore the True Church, and we know, by the Authority of her undoubted Testimony, the True Scripture; for the Infallible Testimony of the Church is absolutely necessary to assure us of Authentick Scripture. And This I cannot see how Protestants can deny, especially when they seriously consider, that in Matters of Religion, it must needs be an unreasonable thing to endeavour to oblige any Man to be Try'd by the Scriptures of a False Religion: For who can in Prudence require of a Christian to stand in debates of Religion to the decisions of the Scripture of the Turks, [the Alcharon.] Doubtless therefore, when Men Appeal to Scripture for determining Religious Differences their Intention is to Appeal to such Scriptures, and such alone, and to All such as are admitted by the True Church: And how can we know, what Scriptures are admitted by the True Church, unless we know, which is the True Church?

So likewise, touching the Exposition of Scripture, without doubt when Protestants fly to Scriptures for their Rule, whereby to square their Religion, and to decide Debates between them and their Adversaries, they Appeal to Scriptures as rightly Understood: For who would be Try'd by Scriptures understood in a wrong Sense? Now when Contentions arise between Them and Others of Differing Judgments concerning the Right Meaning of it; certainly they will not deny, but the Judge to decide this Debate must appertain to the True Religion: For what Christian will apply himself to a Turk or Jew to decide matters belonging to Christianity? Or who will go to an Atheist to determine matters of Religion?

In like manner, when they are forc'd to have recourse to the Private Spirit in Religious Matters, doubtless they design not to Appeal to the Private Spirit of an Atheist, a Jew, or an Heretick, but to the Private Spirit of such as are of the True Religion: And is it possible for them to know certainly who are Members of the True Church? Or what appertains to the True Religion, unless they be certainly Inform'd, Which the True Church is? So that, I say, no Man can be certainly asur'd, Which, or What Books, or How much is True Scripture; Or of the Right Sense, and True Meaning of Scripture, unless he first come to a certainty of the True Church. And of this Opinion was the Great St. Augustin, when he declar'd, That he would not believe the Gospel, if it was not, that the Authority of the Catholick Church moved him to it: Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Ecclesiae Catholicae commoveret Authoritas. S. Aug. lib. contr. Epist. Manich. cap. 5.

## Of Canonical Books of Scripture.

Concil. Trident. Sess. 4. Decret de Canonicis Scripturis.

Mark. e. ult.

The Catholick Church setting always this before her Eyes, That Errors being taken away, the very purity of the Gospel may be preserv'd in the Church: What was promis'd before by the Prophets, in the Holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus CHRIST, the Son of GOD, first publish'd by his own Mouth; and afterwards commanded to be Preach'd to every Creature, by the Apostles, as the Fountain of all wholesome Truth, and of the Discipline, is contain'd in the WRITTEN BOOKS, and in the TRADITIONS NOT WRITTEN, &c. Following the Example of Orthodoxal Fathers, with the Affection of Piety and Reverence; it receives and Honours all the Books both of the Old and New Testament

Rament, seeing One GOD is the Author of Both, &c. These are the words of the Sacred Council of Trent; which further ordain'd, that the Table (or Catalogue) of the Canonical Books should be joyn'd to this Decree, lest doubt might arise to any, which Books they are that are receiv'd by the Synod. They are these following, viz.

## Of the Old Testament.

**F**IVE Books of *Moyses*; that is, *Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy*.

*Josua, Judges, Ruth.*

Four of the *Kings*.

Two of *Paralipomenon*.

The First and Second of *Esdras*, which is call'd *Nehemias*.

*Tobias, Judith, Hester, Job, David's Psalter of 150 Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus. Isaías, Hieremias with Barach, Ezechieiel, Daniel.*

Twelve lesser Prophets; that is, *Osea, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Michæas, Nahum, Abacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachias*.

The First and Second of the *Maccabees*.

But if any Man shall not Receive for Sacred and Canonical these whole Books, with all their Parts, as they are accustom'd to be read in the Catholick Church, and as they are in the Old Vulgar Latin Edition, &c. Be he Anathema.

The Third Council of *Carthage*, after having Decreed, That nothing should be read in the Church under the Name of *Divine Scriptures*, but *Canonical Scriptures*, says, That the *Canonical Scriptures* are *Genesis, Exodus, &c.* so reckoning up all the very same Books, and making particularly the same Catalogue of them, with This recited out of the Council of *Trent*. *St. Augustin*, who was present at, and Subscrib'd to this Council, also numbers the same Books as above; *Vid. Doctr. Christian, Lib. II. cap. 8.*

3 Concil. Carthag. Can. 47.

Notwithstanding which, several of the said Books are by the Protestants rejected as *Apochryphal*; their Reasons are, because they are not in the *Jews Canon*, nor were accepted for Canonical in the *Primitive Church*; Reasons by which they might reject a great many more, if it pleas'd them: But indeed the chief Cause is, That some things in these Books are so manifestly against their Opinions, that they have no other Answer but to reject their Authority; as appears very plainly from these Words of *Mr. Whitakers*: *We pass not*, says he, *for that Raphael mentioned in Tobit, neither acknowledge we these Seven Angels whereof he makes mention; All That differs much from Canonical Scripture, which is reported of that Raphael, and savours of I know not what Superstition. Neither will I believe Free-Will, altho' the Book of Ecclesiasticus confirm it an hundred*

Whit. contra  
Camp. p. 47.

S. Aug. lib de  
Prædict. Sanc. c. 24.

S. Aug. lib.  
11. c. 5. con-  
tra Faustum  
& lib. 2. c. 3 2.  
contra Cres-  
conium.

*bundred Times.* This denying of Books to be Canonical, because the Jews received them not, was also an old Heretical Shift, noted and refuted by St. *Augustin*, touching the Book of *Wisdom*; which some in his Time refus'd, because it convinc'd their Errors: But must it pass for a sufficient Reason amongst Christians to deny such Books, because they are not in the Canon of the Jews? Who sees not that the Canon of the Church of *CHRIST* is of more Authority with all true Christians, than that of the Jews? For a *Canon* is an assured Rule, and warrant of Direction; whereby (says St. *Augustin*) the Infirmit y of our defect in Knowledge is guided, and by which Rule other Books are known to be *GOD's Word*: His Reason is, *Because we have no other Assurance that the Books of Moyses, the Four Gospels, and other Books, are the True Word of GOD, but by the Canon of the Church.* Whereupon the same Great Doctor utter'd that Famous saying, *I would not believe the Gospel, except the Authority of the Catholick Church mov'd me thereunto.*

And that these Books which *Protestants* reject, are by the Church number'd in the Sacred Canon, may be seen above: However to speak of them, in particular, in their Order.

### The Book of Tobias

S. Amb. lib.  
de *Tobias* c. 1.

Lib. 3. Offa.  
c. 24.

S. Aug. Sermon.  
2. 6. de Temp.

S. Chrysostom.

Hom. 15. ad

Heb.

S. Greg. part.

3. Pastor. cu-

ra: admon. 21.

**T**is by St. *Cyprian*, *de Oratione Dominica*, alleadg'd as Divine Scripture, to prove that Prayer is good with Fasting and Alms. St. *Ambrose* calls this Book by the common name of *Scripture*; saying, *He will briefly gather the Virtues of Tobias, which the Scripture in Historical manner lays forth at large*: Calling also this History *Prophetic*, and *Tobias* a *Prophet*: And in another place, alleadges this Book as he does other Holy Scriptures, to prove that the Virtues of *GOD's Servants* far excel the Moral Philosophers. St. *Augustin* made a special Sermon of *Tobias*, as he did of *Job*. St. *Chrysostome* alleang'd it as *Scripture*, denouncing a Curse to the Contemners of it. St. *Gregory* also alleadges it as *Holy Scripture*. St. *Bede* expoun'd the whole Book *Mystically*, as he does other *Holy Scriptures*. St. *Hierom* transl. it out of the *Caldee* Language, judging it more meet to displease the *Pharisaical* Jews to reject it, than not to satisfie the Will of *Holy Bishops*, urging to have it. Ep. ad *Chromat.* & *Heliodorum*. To. 3. In fine, St. *Augustin* telling us the Cause of its being writ, has these words, --- *The Servant of GOD, Holy Tobias, is given to us after the Law, for an Example, that we might know how to Practise the things which we read. And if Temptations come upon us, not to depart from the Fear of GOD, nor expect help from any other than from Him.*

### Of the Book of Judith.

See the Argu-  
ment of the  
Book of Ju-  
dith in the  
Doway Bible  
74. 1.

**T**his Book was by *Origen*, *Tertullian*, and other Fathers, whom St. *Hilary* cites, held for Canonical, before the first General Council of *Nice*; yet St. *Hierom* supposed it not so, till such time as he found that the said Sacred Council reckon'd it in the number of Canonical Scriptures; after which he so esteemed it, that he not only translated it out of the *Caldee* Tongue, wherein 'twas first written, but also as occasion requir'd, cited the same as Divine Scripture, and sufficient to convince Matters of Faith in Controversie; numbring it with other Scriptures, whereof none doubts, saying, *Ruth, Hester, Judith, were of so great Renown, that they gave the Names to Sacred Volumes.* St. *Ambrose*, St. *Augustin*, St. *Chrysostome*, and many other Holy Fathers, account it for Canonical Scripture,

## Part of the Book of Hester.

BY the Councils of *Laodicea* and *Carthage*, this Book was declar'd Canonical; and by most of the Ancient Fathers esteem'd as Divine Scripture; only Two or Three before the said Councils, doubted of its Authority. And tho' St. *Hierom* in his Time, found not certain parts thereof in the *Hebrew*, yet in the *Greek* he found all the sixteen Chapters contain'd in Ten: And 'tis not improbable that these parcels were sometimes in the *Hebrew*, as divers whole Books which are now lost. But whether they ever were so or no, the Church of *CHRIST* accounts the whole Book of Infallible Authority, reading as well these parts as the rest in her publick Office.

*Vid. Doway  
Bible, To. 1.*

## Of the Books of Wisdom.

It is granted, that several of the Ancient Fathers would not urge these Books of *Wisdom*, and others, in their Writings against the *Jews*, not that themselves doubted of their Authority, but because they knew that they would be rejected by the *Jews* as not Canonical: And so St. *Hierom*, in respect of the *Jews*, said these Books were not Canonical; nevertheless, he often alleadg'd Testimonies out of them, as of other Divine Scriptures; sometimes with this Parenthesis (*Si cui tamen placet librum recipere*) in cap. 8. and 12. *Zacharie*: but in his latter Writings absolutely without any such restriction, as in cap. 1. & 56. *Isaiae*. & in 18. *Jeremie*, where he professes to alleadge none but Canonical Scripture. As for the other Ancient Fathers, namely, St. *Irenaeus*, St. *Clement of Alexandria*, *Origen*, St. *Athanasius*, St. *Basil*, St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, St. *Gregory Nyssen*, St. *Epiphanius*, St. *Cyril of Alexandria*, St. *Chrysostome*, St. *Ambrose*, &c. they make no doubt at all of their being Canonical Scripture, as appears by their exp'res tearms [ *Divine Scripture*, *Divine Word*, *Sacred Letters*, *Propheticall saying*, *The Holy Ghost* *faith*, and the like.] And St. *Augustin* affirms, that, *The Sentence of the Book of Wisdom ought not to be rejected*, (by certain inclining to *Pelagianism*) which has so long been publickly read in the Church of *Christ*, and receiv'd of all *Christians*, *Bishops*, and others, even to the last of the *Laiety*, *Penitents* and *Catichumens*, cum Veneratione Divinæ Authoritatis, with *Veneration of Divine Authority*? Which also the excellent Writers, next to the *Apostles* *Times*, alleadging for Witness, ( *Nihil se adhibere nisi Divinum testimonium crediderunt* ) thought they alleadg'd nothing but Divine Testimony.

*Vid. Doway  
Bible, To. 2.  
And. Jodoc.  
Cocce. To. 1.  
Thesauri lib. 6.  
Art. 9.  
S. Aug. in lib.  
de Prædestinat.  
Sanct. cap. 14.  
Ex lib. de Ci-  
vit. Dei. 17.  
c. 20.*

## Of Ecclesiasticus.

What has been said of the foregoing Book, the same may be said also of this. The Holy Fathers above-named, and several others, as St. *Cyprian*, *de opere & Eleemosina*, St. *Gregory the Great*, in *Psal. 50*. 'Tis also reckon'd for Canonical by the Third Council of *Carthage*, and by St. *Augustin*, in *lib. 2. c. 8. Doct. Christian.* & *lib. 17. c. 20. Civit. Dei.*

## Of Baruch, with the Epistle of Jeremy.

Many of the Ancient Fathers suppos'd this Prophecy to be *Jeremiah's*, tho' none of them doubted but *Baruch* his Scribe was the Writer of it; nor but that the Holy Ghost directed him in it: And therefore, by the Fathers and Councils, it has ever

*See the Argu-  
ment of Bar-  
uch's Proph-  
ecy in the D-  
way Bible,  
To. 2.*

S. Hierom in  
Prefat. Jere-  
mia.

been accepted as Divine Scripture. The Council of *Laodicea*, in the last Canon, expressly Names *Baruch*, *Lamentations*, and *Jeremiāb's Epistle*. St. *Hierom* testifies, That he found it in the *Vulgar Latin* Edition, and that it contains many things of *CHRIST*, and the latter Times; tho' because he found it not in the *Hebrew*, nor in the *Jews* Canon, he urges it not against Them. It is by the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent* expressly defin'd to be Canonical Scripture.

### Of the Song of the Three Children, the Idol, Bell and Dragon, with the Story of Susanna.

IT is no just Exception against these and other parts of Holy *Scripture* of the *Old Testament* to say, they are not in the *Hebrew* Edition, being otherwise accepted for Canonical by the Catholick Church: And further, 'tis very probable, that these parcels were sometimes either in the *Hebrew* or *Caldee*, (in which Two Languages, part in one, and part in the other, the rest of the Book of *Daniel* was written) for from whence could the *Septuagint*, *Theodotian*, *Symmachus*, and *Aquila* translate them? in whose Editions St. *Hierom* found them. But if it be Objected, that St. *Hierom* calls them *Fables*, and so did not account them Canonical Scripture: We Answer, that he reporting the *Jews* Opinion, uses their tears, not explaining his own Judgment, intending to deliver sincerely that which he found in the *Hebrew*: Yet would he not omit to Insert the rest, advertising withal, that he had it in *Theodotian's Translation*; which Answer is clearly justify'd by his own Testimony, in these words: — *Whereas I relate (says he) what the Hebrews say against the Hymn of the Three Children; be that for this reputes me a Fool, proves himself a Sycophant; for I did not write what my self judged, but what they are accustom'd to say against me.*

S. Hier. lib. 2.  
c. 9. advers.  
Ruffinian.

Vid. Doway  
Bible, 16. 2.

The Prayer of *Azarias* is alleadg'd as Divine Scripture by St. *Cyprian*, St. *Ephrem*, St. *Chrysostome*, St. *Augustin*, St. *Fulgentius*, and others. The Hymn of the *Three Children* is alleadg'd for Divine Scripture by divers Holy Fathers, as also by St. *Hierom* himself, in cap. 3. ad *Gallatus* & Epist. 49. de *Muliere Septies ita*; also by St. *Ambrose*, and the Council of *Toletā*, c. 13.

So likewise the History of *Susanna* is cited for Holy *Scripture* by St. *Ignatius*, *Tertullian*, St. *Cyprian*, St. *Chrysostome*, who in *Hom. 7. fine*, has a whole Sermon of *Susanna*, as upon Holy *Scripture*: St. *Ambrose* and St. *Augustin*, cite the same also as Canonical.

The History of *Bell* and the *Dragon* are judg'd Divine *Scripture*, St. *Cyprian*, St. *Basil*, and St. *Athanasius*, in *Synopsi*, briefly explicating the Argument of the Book of *Daniel*, makes expref's mention of the Hymn of the *Three Children*, of the History of *Susanna*, and of *Bell* and the *Dragon*.

### Of the Two Books of Maccabees.

Ver since the Third Council of *Carthage*, these Two Books of the *Maccabees* have been held for *Sacred* and *Canonical* by the Catholick Church, as is prov'd by a Council of Seventy Bishops, under Pope *Gelasius*; and by the Sixth General Council, in approving the Third of *Carthage*; as also by the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent*.

But

But because some of the *Church of England* Divines would seem to make their People believe, that the *Maccabees* were not receiv'd for Canonical Scripture in *Gregory the Great's Time* (consequently not before,) I will, besides these Councils, refer you to the Holy Fathers, who liv'd before St. *Gregory's* Days, and alledg'd these Two Books of the *Maccabees* as Divine Scripture: Namely, St. *Clement Alexandrinus*, lib. 1. *Stromat.* St. *Cyprian*, lib. 1. *Epistolarm Ep. 3. ad Cornelium*, lib. 4. Ep. 1. & *de Exhort. ad Martyrium c. 11.* St. *Ishidorus*, lib. 16. c. 1. St. *Gregory Nazianzen* has also a whole Oration concerning the Seven *Maccabees* Martyrs, and their Mother. St. *Ambros.* lib. 1. c. 41. *Offic.* See in St. *Hierom's* Commentaries upon *Daniel*, c. 1. 11, and 12. in how great esteem he had these Books; tho, because he knew they were not in the *Jewish Canon*, he would not urge them against the Jews. And the Great Doctor St. *Augustin*, in lib. 2. c. 8. *de Doctrina Christiana*, & lib. 18. c. 36. *de Civit. Dei*, most clearly avouches, that, *Notwithstanding the Jews deny these Books, the Church holds them Canonical.* And whereas one *Gaudentius* an Heretick, alledg'd, for defence of his Heresie, the Example of *Razias*, who slew himself (2 *Mac. 14.*) St. *Augustin* denies not the Authority of the Book, but discusses the Fact, and admonishes, that it is not unprofitably receiv'd by the Church, *If it be Read or Heard soberly*, which was a necessary Admonition to those *Donatists*, who, not understanding the Holy Scriptures, deprav'd them (as St. *Peter* says of like Hereticks) to their own Perdition. Which Testimonies, I think, may be sufficient to satisfie any one who is not Pertinacious and Obstinate, that these Two Books of the *Maccabees* (as well as others in the *New-Testament*) were receiv'd, and held for Canonical Scripture, long before St. *Gregory the Great's Time*.

See the second  
Vindication of  
the Exposition  
of the Doctrin  
of the Churc  
of England.

Judge now, *Good Reader*, Whether the Author of the *Second Vindication*, &c. has not Impos'd upon the World in this point of the Books of *Maccabees*. And indeed if this were all the Cheat he endeavours to put upon us, it were well, but he goes yet further, and names Eleven points of Doctrine besides this, which he (with his Fellows, quoted in his *Margent*) falsely affirms not to have been Taught in *England* by St. *Augustin* the *Benedictine Monck*, when he Converted our Nation. Telling us, *That the Mystery of Inquiry* (as he Blasphemously terms the Doctrine of *CHRIST's* Holy Church) *was not then come to perfection*. For First, (says he) *The Scripture was yet receiv'd as a perfect Rule of Faith.* Secondly, *The Books of the Maccabees, which you now put in your Canon, were rejected then as Apochryphal.* Thirdly, *That Good-Works were not yet esteem'd Meritorious.* Fourthly, *Nor Auricular Confession a Sacrament.* Fifthly, *That Solitary Masses were disallow'd by him.* And Sixthly, *Transubstantiation yet unborn.* Seventhly, *That the Sacrament of the Eucharist was hitherto Administred in Both kinds, (What then? so it was also in One kind.)* Eighthly, *Purgatory it self not brought either to Certainty or to Perfection.* Ninthly, *That by consequence Masses for the Dead were not intended to deliver Souls from these Torments.* Tenthly, *Nor Images allow'd for any other purpose than for Ornament and Instruction.* Eleventhly, *That the Sacrament of Extreme Unction was yet unform'd, (then you must, with your Master Luther, count St. James's Epistle, an Epistle of Straw.)* Twelvithly, *And even the Popes Supremacy so far from being then Establish'd as it now is, That Pope Gregory thought it to be the fore-runner of Antichrist for one Bishop to set himself above all the rest.*

I will only, in particular, take notice here of this last of his false Instances, because he cites and mis-applies the words of St. *Gregory the Great*, to the deluding of his Reader: Whereas St. *Gregory* did not think it Antichristian or Unlawful for the *Pope*, whom (not himself, but) our Saviour *CHRIST* had set and appointed (in the Person of St.

Peter) above all the rest, to exercise Spiritual Supremacy and Jurisdiction over all the Bishops in the Christian World: But he thought it Antichristian for any Bishop to set up himself, as John Bishop of Constantinople had done, by the Name or Title of *Universal Bishop*, so as if he alone were the *Sole Bishop*, and none Bishop but he in the Universe: And in this Sense St. *Gregory* thought this Name or Title not only worthily forborn in his Predecessors, and by himself, but terms it *Prophane, Sacrilegious, and Antichristian*; and in this Sense the Bishops of *Rome* have always utterly renounc'd the Title of *Universal Bishop*; on the contrary, terming themselves *Servi Servorum Dei*. And this is prov'd from the words of *Andreas Friccius a Protestant*, (whom *Peter Martar* terms *an excellent Learned Man*) Some there are, says he, that Object the Authority of *Gregory*, who says, *That such a Title pertains to the Precursor of Antichrist; but the reason of Gregory is to be known, and it may be gather'd of his Words, which he repeats in many Epistles, That the Title of Universal Bishop is contrary to, and doth gain-say the Grace which is commonly pour'd upon all Bishops; He therefore who calls himself the ONLY Bishop, takes the Episcopal Power from the rest: Wherefore this Title he would have to be rejected, &c. But it is nevertheless evident by other places, That Gregory thought that the Charge and Principallity of the whole Church was committed to Peter, &c. And yet for this Cause Gregory thought not that Peter was the Fore-runner of Antichrist*. Thus evidently and clearly this Protestant Writer explains this difficulty.

To this may be added the Testimonies of other Protestants, who, from the Writings of St. *Gregory*, clearly prove the Bishop of *Rome* to have had and exercis'd Power and Jurisdiction, not only over the *Greek*, but over the *Universal Church*. The *Magdeburgian Centurists* shew us, that the *Roman See* appoints her Watch over the whole World; that the *Apostolick See* is Head of all Churches; that even *Constantinople* is subject to the *Apostolick See*. These Centurists charge more-over the Bishop of *Rome*, in the very Example and Person of Pope *Gregory*, and by Collection out of his Writings, by them particularly alleadg'd, *That he challeng'd to himself Power to Command all Arch-Bishops, to Ordain and Depose Bishops at his Pleasure*. And, *That he claim'd a Right to cite Arch-Bishops, to declare their Cause before him, when they were accus'd*. And also, *To Excommunicate and Depose them, giving Commission to their Neighbour Bishops to proceed against them*. *That, In their Provinces he plac'd his Legates to Know and End the Causes of such as appeal'd to the See of Rome*: With much more touching the Exercise of his Supremacy. To which Dr. *Saund.* adds yet more out of St. *Gregory*'s own Works, and in his own Words, as, *That the See Apostolick, by the Authority of GOD, is prefer'd before all Churches. That all Bishops, if any Fault be found in them, are subject to the See Apostolick. That She is the Head of Faith, and of all the Faithful Members. That the See Apostolick is the Head of all Churches. That the Roman Church, by the Words which CHRIST spake to Peter, was made the Head of all Churches. That no scruple or doubt ought to be made of the Faith of the See Apostolick. That all those things are False, which are Taught contrary to the Doctrine of the Roman Church. That to return from Schism to the Catholick Church, is to return to the Communion of the Bishops of Rome. That he who will not have St. Peter (to whom the Keys of Heaven were committed) to shut him out from the entrance of Life, must not in this World be seperated from his See. That they are perverse Men who refuse to Obey the See Apostolick*.

All these Words of Pope *Gregory* consider'd, Does not this *Vindicator* of the Church of *England*'s Doctrine shew himself a Grand Impostor, to offer to the abus'd Judgment of his unlearned Readers, an Objection so frivolous and misapply'd, upon the advantage only of a naked sounding reseimblance of mistaken Words? To conclude therefore in

*Andreas Friccius de Ecclesiast. l. 2. c. 10.  
pag. 579.*

*Centur. 6 Col.  
425, 426, 427,  
428, 429, 438.*

*Dr. Saund.  
1516, Monar.  
li. 7. & N. 433,  
541.*

the words of Dr. Saunders: *He who reads all these particulars, and more of the same kind that are to be found in the Works of St. Gregory, and yet with a Brazen Forehead, fears not to Interpret that which he writ against the Name of Universal Bishop, so, as if he could not abide that any One Bishop should have the Chief Seat, and Supream Government of the whole Militant Church; That Man (says he) seems to me either to have cast off all understanding and Sense of a Man, or else to have put on the obstinate perverseness of the Devil.*

Dr. Saunders  
supra.

'Tis not my Business, in this place, to digress into particular Replies against his other false Instances \* of the Difference between Pope Gregory the Great's Doctrine, and That of the Council of Trent: I will therefore in general oppose the Words of a Protestant Bishop, against this Protestant Ministerial Guide, and so remit them to the Consideration of the Judicious Reader.

John Bale, a Protestant Bishop, affirms; *That the Religion preach'd by St. Augustin to the Saxons, was Altars, Vestments, Images, Chalices, Crosses, Censors, Holy Vessels, Holy Water, the Sprinkling thereof, Reliques, Translation of Reliques, Dedicating of Churches to the Bones and Ashes of Saints, Consecration of Altars, Chalices and Corporals, Consecration of the Font of Baptism, Chrysme, and Oyl, Celebration of Mass, the Archi-episcopal Pall at Solemn Mass-time, Romish Mass-Books; also Free-Will, Merit, Justification of Works, Penance, Satisfaction, Purgatory, the Unmarry'd Life of Priests, the Publick Invocation of Saints, and their Worship, the Worship of Images, (In another Place he says, That Pope Leo the First decreed, That Men should Worship the Images of the Dead, and allow'd the Sacrifice of the Mass,) Exorcism, Pardons, Vows, Monachism, Transubstantiation, Prayer for the Dead, Offering of the Healthful Host of CHRIST's Body and Blood for the Dead, the Roman Bishop's Claim and Exercise of Jurisdiction and Supremacy over all Churches, (Reliquum Pontificis Superstitionis Chaos) even the whole Chaos of Popish Superstitions. He tells us, That Pope Innocent (who liv'd long before St. Gregory's Time) made the Anointing of the Sick to be a Sacrament.*

These are Bishop Bale's Words; which this *Vindicator* would do well to Reconcile with his *Own*. The like may be found in other Protestants; namely, in Dr. Humphrey in *Jesuitismi*, Part II. The Centurists, &c.

But now to return to the Place where we occasionally enter'd into this *Digression*: You see by what *Authority* and *Testimonies* both of *Councils* and *Fathers*, we have prov'd these *Books*, which *Protestants* reject, to be *Canonical*: Yet, if a Thousand times more were said, it would be all the same with the perverse *Novellists* of our Age, who are resolv'd to be obstinate, and (after their bold and Licentious manner) to receive or reject what they please; still following the Steps of their first Masters, who tore out of the *Bible*, some One Book, some Another, as they found them contrary to their Erroneous and Heretical *Opinions*. For Example:

Whereas Moyses was the First that ever writ any Part of the *Scripture*, and He who writ the *Law of GOD*, [**The Ten Commandments**;] yet Luther thus rejects both Him, and his **Ten Commandments**: --- (a) *We will neither hear nor see Moyses, for he was given only to the Jews; neither does he belong any thing to us.* --- I (says he) *will not receive (b) Moses with his Law; for he is the Enemy of CHRIST.* (c) *Moyses is the Master of all Hang-men.* (d) *The Ten Commandments belong not to Christians.* (e) *Let the Ten Commandments be altogether rejected, and all Heresies will presently cease; for the Ten Commandments are, as it were, the Fountain from whence all Heresies spring.*

\* You'll find some of them hinted at in other places as occasion offers.

Bale in *Act. Rom. Pontif. Edit. Basil.*  
1558. p. 44.  
45, 46, 47, &  
Cent. I. Col.  
3;

Pageant of  
Popes, fol. 27.

Pageant of  
Popes, fol. 26.

(a) *Tom. 3.*  
*German. fol. 40.*  
41, & in *Col.*  
*Eq. Mensal.*  
*Ger. fol. 15.*  
1553.

(b) *In Collec.*  
*Mensal. c. de*  
*Lege & Evan.*

(c) *Ibid. fol.*  
118.

(d) *Surn. de*  
*M. 2.*

(e) *In Cen-*  
*tal Colon.*  
*cited by Au-*  
*fater, c. p. de*  
*Lege.*

(f) See *Ofian-der*, Cent. 16.  
p. 311, 312,  
320.

(g) *Sleidan*  
Hist. 1. 12.  
fol. 162.

(h) *Vid. Confessio. Mansfield-en-surn Ministrorum Tit. de Antinomis, fol. 89, 90.*

(i) *In Serm. Convival. Tit. de Patriarch. & Prophet. & Tit. de libris Ver. & Nov. Test.*

(k) *Vid. Beza in Vita Calvini.*

(l) *Pomeran. ad Rom. c. 8.*  
(m) *In Annot. in Nov. Test. pag. uk.*

(n) *Cent. I. 1. 2. c. 4: Col. 54.*

(o) *Instit. I. 2. c. 16.*  
*In March. 27.*

g. *Harm. in March. 20. 16.*

(p) *Victoria veritatis & ruina Paparus, Arg. 5.*

(q) *Tom. 2. Eleach. f. 10.*  
*Magdeburg. Cent. I. 1. 2. c. 10. Col. 580.*

(r) *Defence of the 39 Articles, Art. 6.*

*The Private Spirit (not the Church) told those Protestants who made the 39 Articles, what Books of Scripture they were to hold for Canonical.*

*Islebius, Luther's Scholar, taught, (f) That the Decalogue was not to be taught in the Church: And from him came (g) the Sect of Antinomans; who publickly taught, that (h) The Law of GOD is not worthy to be call'd the Word of GOD: If thou art an Whore, if an Whoremonger, if an Adulterer, or otherwise a Sinner; Believe, And thou walk'st in the Way of Salvation. When thou art drown'd in Sin even to the bottom, if thou Believ'st, Thou art in the midst of Happiness. All that busie themselves about Moyses, that is, the Ten Commandments, belong to the Devil, to the Gallows, with Moyse.*

*Martin Luther believes not all things to be so done, as they are related in the Book of Job: With him it is, (i) as it were, the Argument of a Fable.*

*Castilio (k) commanded the *Canticles of Solomon* to be thrust out of the *Canon*, as an Impure and Obscene Song; reviling, with bitter Reproaches, such Ministers as resisted him therein.*

*Pomerane, a great Evangelist among the Lutherans, writes thus touching St. James's Epistles: (l) He concludes ridiculously, he cites Scripture against Scripture, which thing the Holy Ghost cannot abide; Wherefore that Epistle may not be number'd among other Books, which set forth the Justice of Faith.*

*Vitus Theodorus, a Protestant-Preacher of Norimberg, writes thus: (m) The Epistle of James, and Apocalyps of John we have of set-purpose left out, because the Epistle of James is not only in certain Places reprobable, where he too much advances Works against Faith; but also his Doctrine throughout is patcht together of divers Pieces, whereof no One agrees with Another.*

*The Magdeburgian Centurists say, (n) That the Epistle of James much swerves from the Analogy of the Apostolical Doctrine, whereas it ascribes Justification not to Only Faith, but to Works; and calls the Law, A Law of Liberty.*

*John Calvin doubted (o) whether the *Apistles Creed* was made by the *Apostles*. He argu'd St. Matthew of Error. He rejected these Words, Many are Call'd, but Few Chosen.*

*Clebitius, (p) an Eminent Protestant, opposes the Evangelists one against another: Matthew and Mark (says he) deliver the contrary; therefore to Matthew and Mark, being Two Witnesses, more Credit is to be given, than to One Luke, &c.*

*Zwinglius, (q) and other Protestants, affirm, That All things in St. Paul's Epistles are not Sacred; and that, In sundry things he Err'd.*

*Mr. Rogers, the great Labourer to our English Convocation-Men, names several of his Protestant Brethren, (r) who rejected for Apocryphal, *The Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, of St. James, the First and Second of John, of Jude, and the Apocalyps*.*

*Thus, you see, these pretended Reformers have torn out some One Piece or Book of Sacred Scripture, some Another; with such a licentious Freedom, rejecting, deriding, discarding, and censuring them, that their Impiety can never be parallel'd but by profess'd Atheists. Yet all these Sacred Books were (as is said) Receiv'd for Canonical in the Third Council of Carthage, above Thirteen Hundred Years ago.*

*But with the Church of England, it matters not by what Authority Books are judg'd Canonical, if the Holy Spirit in the Hearts of her Children, testify them to be from GOD. They telling us (by Mr. Rogers,) That They judge such and such Books Canonical, Not so much because Learned and Godly Men in the Church so have, and do receive and allow them, as for that the Holy Spirit in our Hearts doth testify, that they are from GOD. By instinct of which [Private] Spirit in their Hearts, they decreed as many as they thought good for Canonical, and Rejected the rest; as you may see in the VI of the XXXIX Articles.*

The Church of England has decreed, \* That such are to be understood Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose Authority was never any doubt in the Church: And therefore, by this Rule, She rejects these for Apochryphal, viz.

\* In the 6 of the 39 Art.

Tobit.	Baruch, with the Epistle of	I. Maccabees.
Judeth.	Jeremiah.	II. Maccabees.
The rest of Esther.	The Song of the Three Children.	The Prayer of Manasseth.
Wisdom.	The Idol, Bell and the Dragon.	III. Esdras.
Ecclesiasticus.	The Story of Susanna.	IV. Esdras.

+ The three last are not Numbered in the Canon of the Scripture.

(a) See St. Hieron Ep. ad Hes. q. 3.

(b) S. Hilas. l. 10. de Trinit. §.

Hieron. l. 2 contra Pelagian.

(c) Euseb. H. 3. c. 39.

(d) Id. l. 3. c. 3.

(e) Et c. 25. 25. Hieron

divinis illi- lus. in

P. Jac. Ju. Pet. & Jo. & Ep. ad Dardan.

(f) Survey of Cbr. Suf. p. 664.

Vid. 1. & 4. day Confer. in the Town.

Anno 581.

(g) Def. of the 39 Art.

p. 3 Art. 6. + 3 Coun.

Carthag. Can. 47.

(h) De D. B.

Cerit. l. 2. 8

(i) Ep. ad Exuper. c. 7.

(k) Id. 10. Con. Decret.

cum 70 Epis. p.

(l) Brentius

Apol. Conf.

Wit. Sacrae

script. Ang.

p. 713.

in Cov. 22.

Burg. p. 76,

77, & 78.

In Birk. An

to a Count.

Cathol. p. 5

(o) Jewel

Def. of the

Apol. p. 201.

(o) C. C.

Trid. Sess. 4

Decret. de

Can. Scrip.

But, if none must pass for Canonical, but such as were never doubted of in the Church, I would know, why the Ch. of Eng. admits of such Books of the New Testament, as have formerly been doubted of? Some Ancient Writers doubted of the Last Chap. of S. Mark's Gospel (a): Others of some part of the 22. of St. Luke (b): Some of the Beginning of the 8. of St. John (c): Others of the Epistle to the Hebrews (d): And Others (e) of the Ep. of St. James, Jude, the Second of Peter, the Second and Third of John, and the Apocalyps.

And Dr. Bilson, a Protestant, affirms, That the Scriptures were not fully received in all Places, no, not in Eusebius's Time. He says, The Epistles of James, Jude, the Second of Peter, the Second and Third of John, are contradicted, as not Written by the Apostles. The Epistle to the Hebrews was for a while contradicted, &c. The Churches of Syria did not receive the Second Epistle of Peter, nor the Second and Third of John; nor the Epistle of Jude, nor the Apocalyps. The like might be said for the Churches of Arabia: Will you hence conclude, says this Doctor, That these parts of Scripture were not Apostolick, or that we need not to receive them Now, because they were Formerly doubted of? Thus Dr. Bilson. (f)

And Mr. Rogers (g) confesses, That although some of the Ancient Fathers and Doctors accepted not all the Books contained in the New Testament for Canonical: Yet in the End, they were wholly Taken, and Received by the common Consent of the Church of Christ, in this World, for the very Word of God, &c.

And, by Mr. Rogers's, and the Church of England's leave, so were also these Books, which they call Apocrypha. For, tho' they were (as we do not deny) doubted of, by some of the Ancient Fathers, and not accepted for Canonical; Yet in the End (to use Mr. Rogers's Words) they were wholly Taken and Received by the common Consent of the Church of Christ, in this World, for the Word of God. + Vid. Third Council of Carthage; which decrees, That nothing should be Read in the Church, under the Name of Divine Scriptures, besides Canonical Scriptures: And defining which are Canonical, reckons those which the Church of England reject as Apocryphal. To this Council St. Augustin Subscribed; who (h) with S. Innoc. (i) Gelasius (k), and other Ancient Writers, number the said Books in the Canon of the Script. And Protest. themselves, confess, they were received in the number of Canonical Scriptures.

Brentius (l), a Protestant, says, There are some of the Ancient Fathers, who receive these Apocryphal Books into the number of Canonical Scriptures; and also some Councils command them to be acknowledged as Canonical.

Dr. Covell (m) also affirms of all these Books; That, if Ruffinus be not deceived, they were approved, as parts of the Old Testament, by the Apostles.

So that what Christ's Church receives as Canonical, we are not to doubt of: Dr. Falk (n) avouches, That the Church of Christ has Judgment to discern True Writing from Counterfeit; and the Word of God, from the Writings of Men; and this Judgment she has of the H. G. b. And Jewel (o) says, The Ch. of God has the Spirit of Wisdom, to discern True Script. from False.

To conclude therefore, in the Words of the Council of Trent (p); If any Man shall not receive for Sacred and Canonical, these whole Books, with all their parts, as they are read in the Catholick Church, and as they are in the Vulgar Latin Edition; Let him be Accursed.

## Heretical Translations

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
St. Matth. cap. 16. ver. 18.	(a) <i>Et ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, &amp; super hanc Petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam</i> [μετ' οὐκ ιακωνίας]	And I say to Thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I Build my Church.	(a) Instead of <i>Church</i> , they Tran- slate <b>Congregati- on</b> . — <b>Upon this Rock will I build my Congregation</b> .	It is Corrected in this last Translation.
St. Matth. cap. 18. ver. 17.	<i>Quod si non audie- rit eos, dic Ecclesiae [ιακωνία] si autem Ecclesiam [ιακωνία]  non audierit, sit tibi sicut Ethnicus &amp; Pub- licanus.</i>	And if he will not hear them, tell the <i>Church</i> ; and if he will not hear the <i>Church</i> , let him be as an Hea- then, and as a Pub- lican.	If he will not hear them, tell the Congregation; and if he will not hear the Congregation, &c.	Corrected.
Ephesians, cap. 5. ver. 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32.	<i>Viri diligite uxo- res vestras sicut &amp; Christus dilexit Ec- clesiam.</i>	Husbands Love your Wives, as Christ loved the <i>Church</i> , (v. 25.)	Husbands love your Wives, as Christ loved the Congregation.	Corrected.
	<i>Ut ex hiberet ip- sibi Gloriosam Eccle- siam.</i>	That he might present to himself a Glorious <i>Church</i> , (v. 27.)	That he might present to himself a glorious Congre- gation.	Corrected.
	<i>Sacramentum hoc est magnum; Ego au- tem dico in Christo &amp; Ecclesia [ιακωνία.]</i>	For this is a great Sacrament; but I speak in Christ, and in the <i>Church</i> , v. 32, &c.	For this is a great Secret, for I speak in Christ, and in the Congre- gation.	Corrected.
Hebrews, cap. 2. ver. 23.	<i>Et Ecclesiam pri- mitivorum [ιακωνία.]</i>	And the <i>Church</i> of the First-Born.	And the Congre- gation of the First- Born.	Corrected.
Canticles, cap. 6. v. 8.	(b) <i>Una est Co- lumba mea. ΗΠΩΝ μία.</i>	My Dove is One.	(b) My Dove is alone.	My Dove is but One.
Ephesians, cap. 1. ver. 22, 23.	(c) <i>Et ipsum de- dit Caput supra omnem Ecclesiam, quae est Corpus ipius, &amp; ple- nitudo ejus, qui omnia in omnibus adimpletur [τὰ πληρωμάτα.]</i>	And hath made him Head over all the <i>Church</i> , which is his Body, the fulness of him which is filled all in all.	(c) And gave him to be the Head over all things to the Congregation, which is his Body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.	And gave Him to be the Head over all Things to the <i>Church</i> , which is his Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

**T**He Two English Bibles, accustomed to be read in the Protestant Congregations, at their first rising, left out the Word *Catholick*, in the Title of all those Epistles, which have been known by the Name of *Catholice Epistole*, ever since the Apostles Time\*. And their latter Translations (dealing somewhat more Honestly) have turned the Word *Catholick* into *General*, saying, *The General Epistle of James, of Peter, &c.* As if we should say in our Creed, *We believe the General Church*. So that, by this Rule, when St. *Augustin* says, That the manner was in Cities, where there was Liberty of Religion, to ask, *Quâ itur ad Catholicam?* We must Translate it, *Which is the way to the General?* And when St. *Hierom* says, If we agree in Faith with the Bishop of *Rome*, *Ergo Catholicus sumus*: we must Translate, *Then we are Generals*: Is not this good Stuff?

Bib. 1562.  
1577.  
\* Eusebius  
Hist. Eccl.  
lib. 2. c. 23.  
fine.

Bible Printed  
Anno.  
1562.

(a) And as they Suppress the Name *Catholick*; even so did they, in their first English Bible, the Name of *Church* it self: Because at their first Revolt and *Apostacy* from that *Church*, which was universally known to be the only true *Catholick Church*, it was a great Objection against their *Schismatrical Proceedings*, and stuck much in the Peoples Consciences, that they left and forsook the *Church*, and that the *Church* condemn'd them: To obviate which, in the English Translation of 1562. they so totally Suppressed the Word *Church*, that 'tis not once to be found in all that *Bible*, so long read in their *Congregations*; because, knowing Themselves not to be the *Church*, they were resolv'd not to leave God Almighty any *Church* at all, where they could possibly root it out, [viz. in their *Bible*.] And 'tis probable, if t had been as easie for them to have Eradicated the *Church* out of the *Earth*, as it was to blot the Word out of their *Bible*, they would have prevented its *Continuing to the End of the World*.

Another cause of their Suppressing the Name *Church*, was, *That it should never be found in the common Peoples Ears, out of Scriptures*; and that it might seem to the Ignorant, a good Argument against the Authority of the *Church*, to say, *We find not this Word Church in all the Bible*: As in other Articles, where they find not the Express Words in the *Scripture*.

Our Blessed Saviour says, *Upon this Rock will I build my Church*; But they make him say, *Upon this Rock I will build my Congregation*. They make the Apostle St. *Paul* say to *Timothy* (1 Ep. c. 3.) *The House of God, which is the Congregation* [not the *Church*] *of the Living God, the Pillar and Ground of Truth*. Thus they thrust out God's Glorious, Unspotted, and most Beautiful Spouse, the *Church*; and, in place of it, Intrude their own Little, Wrinkled, and Spotted *Congregation*. So, they boldly make the Apostle say, *He hath made him Head of the Congregation, which is his Body*: And, in another place, *The Congregation of the First Born*; where the Apostle mentions *Heavenly Jerusalem*, the City of the *Living God*, &c. So that, by this Translation, there is no longer any *Church Militant* and *Triumphant*, but only *Congregation*; in which they contradict St. *Augustin*, who affirms, *That tho' the Jews Congregation was sometimes called a Church, yet the Apostles never called the Church a Congregation*. But their last Translation having restored the Word *Church*, I shall say no more of it in this place.

(b) Again, The True *Church* is known by *Unity*, which *Mark* is given *Her* by *Christ* himself; In whose Person *Solomon* speaking, says, *Una est Columba mea*; that is, *One is my Dove*, or, *My Dove is One*: Instead of this, They (being Themselves full of *Sects* and *Divisions*) will have it, *My Dove is Alone*: tho' neither the *Hebrew* nor *Greek* Word hath that signification; but, on the contrary, as properly signifies *One*, as *Unus* doth in *Latin*. But this is also amended in their last Translation.

(c) Nor was it enough for them to corrupt the Scripture, against the *Churches Unity*; for there was a Time, when their *Congregation* was *Invisible*; that is to say, when *They were not at all*: And therefore, because they will have it, That *Christ* may be without his *Church*, to wit, a *Head* without a *Body*; they falsifie this place in the Epistle to the *Eph. c. 11. v. 22, 23.* Translating, *Hegazetis* him to be the *Head over all things to the Church*, [*Congregation* with them] which (*Church*) is his *Body*, the *Fulness of him that filleth all in all*. Here they translate Actively the *Greek* Word, *τον τελειωτα*; when, according to St. *Chrysostome*, and all the *Greek* and *Latin* Doctors Interpretation, it ought to be translated *Passively*; so that, instead of saying, *And filleth all in all*; they should say, *The fulness of him which is filled all in all*; all faithful Men, as *Members*, and the whole *Church* as the *Body*, concurring to the fulness of *Christ* the *Head*. But thus they will not Translate, because says *Berza*, *Christ* needs no such *Complement*: And if he need it not, then may he be without a *Church*; and consequently, 'tis no Absurdity, if the *Church* has been for many *Years* not only *Invisible*, but also not at all. Would a Man easily imagine, that such secret Poyson could lurk in their Translations? Thus they deal with the *Church*; let's now see, how they use particular points of Doctrine:

Protestants  
will have  
*Christ* to be  
an *Head*  
without a  
*Body*, du-  
ring all that  
Time that  
their *Congre-  
gation* was  
*invisi-  
ble*, viz.  
about 1500  
Years.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
St. Matth. Cap. 26. Ver. 26.	(a) <i>Accepit Jesus panem &amp; Benedixit, [τῷ εὐογνώ] ac fre- git deditque, &amp;c.</i>	Jesus took Bread and <i>Blessed</i> , and brake, and gave to His Disciples.	(a) Instead of <i>Blessed</i> , they Tran- slate, <i>And when he had given Thanks.</i>	Corrected.
St. Mark, Cap. 14. Ver. 22.	(a) <i>Accepit Jesus panem &amp; Benedicens, [τῷ εὐογνώ] &amp;c.</i>	Jesus took Bread, and <i>Blessing</i> , &c.	(a) Instead of <i>Blessing</i> , they say, <i>and when he had given Thanks.</i>	Corrected.
Acts Apost. cap. 3. ver. 21.	(b) <i>Quem oportet quidem Cælum fusi- pere usque in tempora restitutionis omnium, [οὐ διὰ ἐγὼ οὐδὲν.]</i>	Whom Heaven truly must <i>Receive</i> , until the Times of the restitution of all Things.	(b) Instead of <i>Receive</i> , they say, <i>Whom Heaven must Contain. And Beza, Who must be contained in Heaven.</i>	Corrected.
Jeremiah, cap. 11. ver. 19.	(c) <i>Mittamus lig- num in Panem ejus.</i>	Let us cast Wood upon his <i>Bread</i> .	We will destroy his <i>Heart</i> with Wood. In another Bible, <i>Let us de- stroy the Tree with the Fruit.</i>	Let us destroy the Tree with the <i>Fruit</i> thereof.
Genesis, cap. 14. ver. 18.	(d) <i>At vero Mel- chizedek Rex Salem proferens Panem &amp; vinum, erat enim Sa- cerdos Dei Altissimi.</i>	And Melchizedek, King of <i>S A L E M</i> , brought forth Bread and Wine; <i>For</i> he was the Priest of God most high.	(d) Instead of <i>For</i> <i>He was the Priest</i> ; they Tran- slate, <i>And he was the Priest</i> , &c.	Instead of <i>For</i> , they Translate <i>And</i> .

(a) **T**HE turning of *Blessing* into bare *Thanksgiving*, was one of the first steps of our pretended *Reformers*, towards the denying the *Real Presence*. By endeavouring to take away the Operation and Efficacy of *CHRIST*'s *Blessing*, pronounced upon the *Bread* and *Wine*, They would make it no more than a *Thanksgiving* to *GOD*: And that, not only in Translating *Thanksgiving* for *Blessing*, but also in urging the *Word Eucharist*, to prove it a mere *Thanksgiving*; tho' we find the Verb *εὐχαριστεῖν* us'd also Transitively by the Greek Fathers, saying, *εὐχαριστεῖσθαι Πάνεμον* & *Chalicem Eucharistisatos*; or, *Panem, in quo grātia acte sunt*; that is, *Which, by the Word of Prayer and Thanksgiving, is made a Consecrated Meat, the Flesh and Blood of CHRIST*. St. Paul also, speaking of this *Sacrament*, calls it, (1 Cor. 10.) *The Chalice of Benediction, which we do Bless*; which St. Cyprian thus expatiates, *The Chalice Consecrated by Solemn Blessing*. St. Basil, and St. Chrysostome, in their *Liturgies*, say thus, *Bless, O Lord, the Sacred Bread*; and, *Bless, O Lord, the Sacred Cup, changing it by thy Holy Spirit*: where is signified the Consecration and Transmutation thereof, into the *Body and Blood of CHRIST*.

(b) And by this corrupt Translation, they would have *CHRIST* so Included in *Heaven*, that He cannot be with us upon the *Altar*. *Beza* confesses, *That he Translates it thus, on purpose to keep Christ's Presence from the Altar*; which is so far from the *Greek*, that not only *Ilyricus*, but even *Calvin* himself, dislikes it. And you may easily judge, how contrary to St. Chrysostome it is, who tells us, *That Christ Ascending into Heaven, both left us His Flesh, and yet Ascending hath the same*. And again, *O Miracle!* says he, *He that sits above with the Father, in the same Moment of Time is handled with the Hands of All*. This, you see, is the *Faith and Doctrine of the Ancient Fathers*; and it is the *Faith of the Catholick Church*, at this day. Who sees not, That this *Faith* is far greater, thus to believe the *Presence of CHRIST* in both *Places* at once, because He is *Omnipotent*; than the *Protestant* *Faith*, which believes no further than that He is *Ascended*; and that therefore He cannot be *Present* upon the *Altar*, nor dispose of his *Body* as He pleases? If We should ask them, whether He was also in *Heaven*, when He appeared to *Saul* going to *Damascus*; or, whether He can be both in *Heaven*, and with his *Church on Earth*, to the end of the *World*, as He promises; perhaps, by this *Doctrine* of *Theirs*, They would be put to a stand?

Consider further, how plain our *Saviour's Words* [*This is my Body*] are for the *Real Presence* of His *BODY*: And for the *Real Presence* of His *BLOOD* in the *Chalice*, what can be more plainly spoken, than, — *This is the Chalice, the New Testament in my Blood, which [Chalice] is shed for you*: According to the *Greek*, [*τὸ τοπεῖον τὸ ξελύμανον*] the *Word* [*Which*] must needs be referred to the *Chalice*: In which Speech, *Chalice* cannot otherwise be taken, than for *That* in the *Chalice*; which, sure, must needs be the *Blood of Christ*, and not *Wine*, because His *Blood* only was shed for us; According to St. Chrysostome, who says, *That which is in the Chalice, is the same which gushed out of his Side*: And this deduction so troubled *Beza*, that he exclaims against all the *Greek Copies* in the *World*, as Corrupted in this place.

(c) *Let us cast Wood upon his Bread*; that is, saith St. Hierom †, *The Cross upon the Body of our Saviour*; for it is *He* that said, *I am the Bread that descended from Heaven*: Where the Prophet so long before, saying, *Bread*, and meaning his *Body*, alludes Prophetically to his *Body* in the *Blessed Sacrament*, made of *Bread*, and under the form of *Bread*; and therefore, also called *Bread* by the *Apostle* (1 Cor. 10.): So that both in the *Prophet*, and the *Apostle*, his *Bread* and his *Body* is all one. And lest We should think the *Bread* only signifies his *Body*, he says, *Let us put the Cross upon his Bread*; that is, upon his *very Natural Body* that hung on the *Cross*. 'Tis evident, that the *Hebrew Verb* is not now the same with *That*, which the *Seventy Interpreters* Translated into *Greek*, and St. *Jerom* into *Latin*; but altered, as may be supposed, by the *Jews*, to obscure this *Prophecy* of their Crucifying *CHRIST* upon the *Cross*: And tho' *Protestants* will needs take the advantage of this Corruption; yet so little does the *Hebrew Word*, that now is, agree with the *Words* following, that they cannot so Translate it, as to make any commodious Sense or Understanding of it; as appears by their different Translations, and their Transposing their *Words* in *English*, otherwise than they are in the *Hebrew*.

(d) If *Protestants* should grant *Melchizedek's Typical Sacrifice of Bread and Wine*, then would follow also, a *Sacrifice of the New Testament*; which, to avoid, They purposely Translate [*And*] in this place; when, in other \* *places*, the same *Hebrew Particle* [*וְ*] They Translate *Enim, For*; not being Ignorant, that it is in those, as in this place, better express by *For* or *Because*, than by *And*. See the *Exposition of the † Fathers* upon it.

St. Justin  
in fine 2.  
Apolog.  
St. Irenaeus  
lib. 3. 34.

Hom. 2. ad  
Popul. An-  
nocation.  
lib. 3. de  
Sacerdotia.

Luke 22.  
ver. 20. —

St. Chrys-  
ostome in 1  
Cor. cap.  
10. Hom.  
24.  
† St. Hier.  
in Com. in  
cap. 11. ver.  
19. Hierem.  
Prophecia.

\* Gen. 20.  
ver. 3.  
Gen. 30.  
ver. 27.  
Isaiah, 64.  
ver. 5.  
† St. Cyprian  
in Ep. 63.  
Epiph. bar.  
55, & 79.

St. Hierom  
in Mathe.  
26. & in  
Fest. ad  
Eusebium.

<i>The Book, Chapter, and Verse.</i>	<i>The Vulgar Latin Text.</i>	<i>The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.</i>	<i>Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.</i>	<i>The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.</i>
Proverbs, cap. 9. ver. 5.	(a) <i>Venite come- dite Panem meum, &amp; Bibite Vinum quod Miscui vobis</i> [xviies] <i>et</i> <i>ad</i> <i>veni</i> .	Come Eat my Bread, and Drink the Wine which I have Mingled for you.	(a) The Corruption is, Drink the Wine which I have Drawn; instead of Mingled.	Come Eat of my Bread, and Drink of the Wine which I have mingled.
Proverbs, cap. 9. ver. 1.	(a) <i>Immolavit victimas suas Miscolit Vinum</i> [xviiesv.]	She hath Immolated Her Hosts, She hath Mingled Her Wine.	(a) She hath Drawn her Wine.	She hath Killed her Beasts; she hath mingled her Wine.
1 Corinth. cap. 11. ver. 27.	<i>Itaque quicunque manducaverit Panem hunc, Vel</i> [h] <i>Bibe- rit Calicem Domini indigne, &amp;c.</i>	Therefore, who- soever shall Eat this Bread, Or Drink the Chalice of our Lord unworthily, &c.	—	Wherefore, who- soever shall Eat this Bread, And Drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, &c.
1 Corinth. cap. 9. ver. 13.	(b) <i>Et qui Altari deserviunt, cum Altari participant</i> [θυσασθενον] <i>et</i> <i>τοιον</i> .	And they that serve the Altar, participate with the Altar.	(b) Instead of Altar, they Translate Temple.	Corrected.
1 Corinth. cap. 10. ver. 28.	(b) <i>Nonne qui edunt Hostias parti- cipes sunt Altaris</i> [θυσασθενον].	They that Eat the Hosts, are they not Partakers of the Altar?	(b) Partakers of the Temple?	Corrected.
Daniel, cap. 14. ver. 12.	(c) <i>Quia fecerant sub Mensa abscondita introitum</i> [τεραμ?a.]	For they had made a Privy En- trance under the Table.	(c) For, under the Table, they say, Under the Altar.	The Two last Chapters they call Apocrypha.
Et ver. 17.	<i>Intuitus Rex Men- sam.</i>	The King beholding the Table.	The King beholding the Altar.	
Et etiam Vers. 20.	<i>Et consumebant que erant super Men- sam.</i>	And they did con- sume the things which was upon the Table.	Which was up- on the Altar.	

(a) These Prophetical Words of Solomon's are of great Importance, as being a manifest Prophecy of CHRIST's mingling Water and Wine in the Chalice at His last Supper; which, at this Day, the Catholick Church observes: But Protestants, counting it an Idle Ceremony, frame their Translation accordingly; suppressing altogether this Mixture or Mingling, contrary to the true Interpretation both of the Greek and Hebrew; as also, contrary to the Ancient Fathers Exposition of this Place. *The Holy Ghost*, (saith St. Cyprian) by Solomon, fore-saveth a Type of our Lord's Sacrifice, of the Immolated Host of Bread and Wine; saying, *Wisdom hath killed her Hosts, She hath mingled her Wine into the Cup. Come ye, Eat my Bread, and Drink the Wine that I have mingled for you.* Speaking of *WINE MINGLED*, (saith this Holy Doctor) *He fore-saveth Prophecy, the Cup of our Lord MINGLED WITH WATER AND WINE.* St. Justin, from the same Greek Word, calls it, *κράτας*; that is, (according to Plutarch) *Wine mingled with Water*: So likewise does St. Irenaeus: See also the Sixth General Council, † treating largely hereof, and deducing it from the Apostles, and Ancient Fathers; and Interpreting this Greek Word by another Equivalent, and more plainly signifying this mixture, viz. *κράτας*.

Ep. 63. 2.

In this place, they very falsely Translate *And*, instead of *Or*, contrary both to the Greek and Latin. And this they do, on purpose to infer a necessity of Communicating under Both kinds, as the Conjunction [ *And* ] may seem to do: Whereas, by the Disjunctive [ *Or* ] 'tis evident, That we may Communicate in One kind only; as was, in divers cases, the Practice of the Primitive Church; as also of the Apostles Themselves, (Act. 2. 42. and 20. 7.)

Apol. 2. in fine.  
St. Irenaeus lib. 5. prop. Init.  
† Concil. Constanti-rop. 6.  
Can. 32.

But the practice of our Saviour is the best Witness of his Doctrine; who, sitting at the Table at *Emaus* \*, with two of his Disciples, Took Bread, and Blessed, and Brake it, and did reach to them. By which St. Augustin, and † other Fathers, understand the *Eucharist*: Where no mention's made of Wine, or the Chalice; but the reaching of the Bread, their knowing Him, and his Vanishing away so joyned, that not any Time is left for the Benediction and Consecration of the Chalice.

\* Luke 24. ver. 30.  
Lib. 3. de Confessu.  
† Hier. E-  
pitaph Pau-  
la. beda.  
Theophilus.  
St. Cyprian.  
I. de lapsis  
n. 10.  
Tertul. 1. 2.  
ad Tert. n. 3.  
Eccl. Eccl.  
Hist. 1. 6. c.  
36.

In the Primitive Times, It was the custom to administer the Blood only to Children, as St. Cyprian tells us: And, both He and Tertul. say, That it was their Practice, most commonly, to reserve the Body of Christ: Which, as *Ensebini* witnesseth, They were wont to give alone to Sick People, for their Viaticum: Also, *The Holy Hermits in the Wilderness*, commonly receiv'd and reserv'd the Blessed Body alone, and not the Blood, as St. Basil tells us.

St. Basil  
Ep. ad Ca-  
sianum Pa-  
triarch.

For Whole Christ is Really Present, under either kind, as Protestants themselves have confess'd; read their Words in *Hospius* \* a Protestant, who affirms, That They believed and confessed Whole Christ to be really Present, Exhibited and Received under Either Kind; and therefore under the only Form of Bread: Neither did they judge those to do Evil, who Communicated under One Kind.— And Luther, as alledg'd by *Hospius* † says, That it is not needful to give Both Kinds, but the One alone sufficeth; the Church has Power of Ordaining only One, and the People ought to be content therewith, if it be Ordained by the Church. Whence is granted, That 'tis Lawful for the Church of God, upon just occasions, absolutely to determine or limit the use thereof.

\* Hospius.  
Hist. Sa-  
cram. Part.  
2. Fol. 112.  
† Id. 1. 1. 12.

(b) To Translate *Temple* instead of *Altar*, is so gross a Corruption, that had it not been done thrice immediately within two Chapters, one would have thought it had been done of over-sight, and not of purpose. The Name of *Altar* both in *Hebrew* and *Greek*, and by the custom of all People, both *Jews* and *Pagans*, implies and imports a Sacrifice. We therefore, in respect of the Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood, say *Altar*, rather than *Table*, as all the Ancient Fathers were accustomed to Speak and Write; tho', in respect of Eating and Drinking Christ's Body and Blood, it is also called a *Table*. But because Protestants will have only a Communion of *Bread* and *Wine*, or a *Supper*, and no *Sacrifice*; therefore, They call it *Table* only, and abhor the Word *Altar*, as Papistical; especially in their first Translation of 1562. which was made when they were digging down *Altars* throughout *England*.

1 Cor. 10. 4  
ver. 21.

(c) Where the Name *Altar* should be, they Suppress it; and Here, where it should not be, they put it in their *Translations*; and that Thrice in one Chapter; and that either on purpose to dishonour *Catholick Altars*, or else to save the credit of their *Communion-Table*; as fearing, lest the Name of *Bell's Table* might redound to the dishonour of their *Communion-Table*. Wherein 'tis to be wondred, how they could imagine it any disgrace, either for *Table* or *Altar*, if the *Idols* also had their *Tables* and *Altars*, whereas St. Paul so plainly Names both together; *The Table of our Lord, and the Table of Devils*. If the *Table of Devils*, why not the *Table of Bell*? By this we see, how light a thing it was with them to Corrupt the *Scripture* in those days.

<i>The Book, Chapter, and Verse.</i>	<i>The Vulgar Latin Text.</i>	<i>The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.</i>	<i>Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579</i>	<i>The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.</i>
<i>Acta Apost. cap. 15. ver. 2.</i>	<i>Statuerunt ut Af- cenderent Paulus &amp; Barnabas &amp; quidam alii ex aliis ad Apo- stolos &amp; Presbyteros [πρεσβυτερος] in Jeru- salem, &amp;c.</i>	<p>They appointed that Paul and Bar- nabas should go up, and certain others of the rest, to the Apo- stles and <i>Priests</i> unto Jerusalem.</p>	<p>Instead of <i>Priests</i>, they Translate <b>Eld- ers</b>:</p>	<p>For <i>Priests</i>, they say here also <i>Elders</i>.</p>
<i>Titus, cap. 1. ver. 5.</i>	<i>Hujus rei gratia reliqui te Cretæ, ut ea quæ defunt corrigas, &amp; constituas per Ci- vitates Presbyteros sicut &amp; ego disposui tibi.</i>	<p>For this cause left I thee in Creet, that thou shouldest Re- form the things that are wanting, and shouldest Ordain <i>Priests</i> by Cities, as I also appointed thee.</p>	<p>Instead of <i>Priests</i>, they Translate <b>Eld- ers</b>:</p>	<p>For <i>Priests</i> they say <i>Elders</i>.</p>
<i>1 Timoth. cap. 5. ver. 17.</i>	<i>Qui bene Præsunt Presbyteri duplice honore digni habeantur.</i>	<p>The <i>Priests</i> that Rule well, let them be esteemed worthy of double Honour.</p>	<p><b>The Elders that Rule well, &amp;c.</b></p>	<p><i>Elders</i> also in this Bible.</p>
<i>1 Timoth. cap. 5. ver. 19.</i>	<i>Adversus Presby- terum accusationem noli recipere, &amp;c.</i>	<p>Against a <i>Priest</i> receive not Accula- tion, &amp;c.</p>	<p><b>Against an El- der receive not ac- cusation, &amp;c.</b></p>	<p>Instead of <i>Priest</i> they put <i>Elder</i>.</p>
<i>St. James, cap. 5. ver. 14.</i>	<i>Infirmatur quis in vobis inducat Presby- teros Ecclesie &amp; o- rent super eum.</i>	<p>Is any Man Sick among you, let him bring in the <i>Priests</i> of the Church, and let them Pray over him.</p>	<p>----- <b>Let him bring in the Elders of the Congregati- on, &amp;c.</b></p>	<p><i>Elders</i> for <i>Priests</i> here also.</p>

St. Augustin affirms, That in the Divine Scripture several Sacrifices are mentioned, Some Before the Manifestation of the New Testament, &c. and Another Now, which is agreeable to this Manifestation, &c. and which is demonstrated not only from the Evangelical, but also from the Prophetic, Writings: A Truth most certain; our Sacrifice of the New Testament being clearly proved from the Sacrifice of Melchizedek in the Old Testament; of whom, and whose Sacrifice, 'tis said, But Melchizedek, King of Salem, brought forth Bread and Wine; for he was the Priest of God most high, and he blessed him, &c. And to make the Figure agree to the Thing figured, and the Truth to answer the Figure of Christ; 'tis said, Our Lord has Sworn, and it shall not repent him; Thou art a Priest for ever, according to the Order of Melchizedek. In the New Testament, Jesus is made an High Priest, according to the Order of Melchizedek. For, according to the Similitude of Melchizedek, there arises another Priest, — who Continues for ever, and has an everlasting Priesthood Whence is clearly proved, That Melchizedek was a Priest, and Offered in Sacrifice, Bread and Wine; therein prefiguring Christ our Saviour, and his Sacrifice daily Offered in the Church, under the Forms of Bread and Wine, by an everlasting Priesthood.

St. August.  
Ep. 49. q. 3.

Psal. 110.  
ver. 4.  
Hebr. 6.  
ver. 20. 13  
cap. 7. ver.  
15, 17, 24.

But the English Protestants, on purpose to Abolish the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, did not only take away the Word Altar, out of the Scripture; but they also Suppress'd the Name Priest in all their Translations, turning it into Elder (a); well knowing, that these Three, Priest, Sacrifice, and Altar, are Dependents and Consequents one of another; so that they cannot be separated. If there be an External Sacrifice, there must be an External Priesthood to Offer it; and an Altar to Offer the same upon. So CHRIST himself being a Priest, according to the Order of Melchizedek, had a Sacrifice, His Body; and an Altar, His Cross, on which He Offer'd it. And because He Instituted this Sacrifice, to continue in His Church for ever, in Commemoration and Representation of His Death; therefore did He ordain His Apostles Priests, at His Last Supper; where, and when He Instituted the Holy Order of Priesthood or Priests (saying, HOC FACITE, Do this) to Offer the self-same Sacrifice in a Mystical and Un-bloody manner, until the World's End.

But our New Pretended Reformers have made the Scriptures quite Dumb, as to the Name of any such Priest or Priesthood, as We now speak of; never so much as once naming Priest, unless when mention is made either of the Priests of the Jews, or of the Priests of the Gentiles; especially when such are reprehended, and blam'd in the Holy Scripture; and in such places they are sure to name Priests in their Translations, on purpose to make the very Name of Priest Odious among the common Ignorant People.— Again, They have also the Name, Priests, when they are taken for all manner of Men, Women, or Children, that Offer Internal and Spiritual Sacrifices; whereby they would falsely signify, That there are no other Priests in the Law of Grace. As Whi:aker, one of their great Champions, freely avouches, directly contrary to St. Augustin; who, in one brief Sentence, distinguishes Priests, properly so call'd in the Church; and Priests, as it is a common Name to all Christians. This Name then of Priest and Priesthood, properly so called, (as St. Augustin says) They wholly Suppress; never Translating the Word Presbyteros, Priests, but Elders; and that with so full and general consent, in All Their English Bibles, that (as the Puritans plainly confess, and Mr. Whigift denies it not) a Man would wonder to see, how careful They are, that the People may not once hear of the Name of any such Priest in all the Holy Scriptures: And even in their Latter Translations, tho' They are ashamed of the Word Eldership; yet they have not the Power to put the English Word Priesthood, as they ought to do, in the Text, that the Vulgar might understand it; but rather the Greek Word Presbytery: Such poor Shifts They are glad to make use of.

Whitaker,  
pag. 199.  
St. August.  
lib. 20. de  
Civit. Dei,  
cap. 10.

See the  
Puritans  
Reply, pag.  
159. And  
Whigifts  
Defence a-  
gainst the  
Puritan.,  
pag. 722.

So blinded were these Novellists with Heresie, that They could not see, how the Holy Scriptures, the Fathers, and Ecclesiastical Custom, have drawn several Words from their Prophane and Common Signification, to a more Peculiar and Ecclesiastical One; as Episcopus, which in Tully is an Overseer, is a Bishop in the New Testament; so the Greek Word χειροτονία, signifying Ordain, They Translate as Prophanely, as if They were in hand with Demosthenes, or the Laws of Athens, rather than the Holy Scriptures; when as St. Hierom tells them, That it signifieth, Clericorum Ordinationem; that is, Giving of Holy Orders, which is done not only by Prayer of the Voice, but by Imposition of the Hands; according to St. Paul unto Timothy, Impose hands suddenly on no Man; that is, Be not hasty to give Holy Orders. In like manner, they Translate Minister for Deacon, Embassador for Apostle, Messenger for Angel, &c. leaving, I say, the Ecclesiastical use of the Word, for the Original signification.

St. Hierom:  
in cap. 58.  
Eccles.

## Heretical Translations

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Acts Apost. cap. 14. ver. 22.	(a) <i>Et cum Con- stituissent [χειροτό- νωσι] illis per singu- las Ecclesias Presby- teros [πρεσβύτερος.]</i>	And when they had Ordained to them <i>Priests</i> in eve- ry <i>Church</i> .	And when they had ordained El- ders by Election in every Congregati- on.	Elders set instead of <i>Priests</i> .
1. Timoth. cap. 4. ver. 14.	(b) <i>Noli neglegere Gratiam [χαριτατο] que in te est qua data est tibi per Prophetiam cum Impositione manuum Presbyterii.</i>	Neglect not the Grace that is in thee, which is given thee by Prophecy, with Imposition of the hands of <i>Priesthood</i> .	(b) Instead of Grace, they Trans- late <i>Gift</i> ; And <i>Eldership</i> , instead of <i>Priesthood</i> .	For the Word <i>Grace</i> , they say <i>Gift</i> ; And <i>Presbytery</i> , the Greek Word, rather than the English Word; <i>Priesthood</i> .
2 Timoth. cap. 1. ver. 6.	<i>Propter quam cau- sam admoneo te ut resuscites Gratiam Dei que est in te per Impositionem manuum mearum.</i>	For the which cause I admonish thee, that thou re- fuscite the <i>Grace</i> of God, which is in thee, by the Imposi- tion of my Hands.	Instead of the Word <i>Grace</i> , They say <i>Gift</i> .	They Translate <i>Gift</i> , instead of <i>Grace</i> .
2 Timoth. cap. 3. ver. 8.	(c) <i>Diaconos fi- militer Pudicos non bilingues, &amp;c. [Διάκονος.]</i>	Deacons in like- manner <i>Chaste</i> , not double-tongued, &c.	(c) <i>Ministers</i> for Deacons.	Likewise must the Deacons be <i>Grave</i> .
Et ver. 12.	(d) <i>Διάκονοι, Diacons.</i>	Deacons.	Deacons.	Deacons.

(a) WE have heard, in Old Time, of making *Priests*; and, of Late days, of making *Ministers*; but who-ever heard (in *England*) of making *Elders by Election*? yet, in their First Translations, it continued a Phrase of *Scripture*, till King *James* the First's Time; and then They thought good to blot out the Words [*by Election*,] beginning to consider, that such *Elders* as were made only by *Election*, without *Consecration*, Could not pretend to much more Power of Administering the *Sacraments*, than a *Church-Warden*, or *Constable* of the Parish; for, if they deny'd *Ordination* to be a *Sacrament*†; and consequently, to give Grace, and Imprefs a Character, doubtless they could not attribute much to a bare *Election*: And yet, in those Days, when this Translation was made, Their Doctrine was, *That in the New Testament, Election, without Consecration, was sufficient to make a Priest or Bishop*: Witness *Cranmer* himself, who being ask'd, Whether in the *New Testament*, there is required any *Consecration* of a *Bishop* or *Priest*? Answered thus, under his Hand, *viz.* *In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a Priest or Bishop, needeth no Consecration by the Scripture; for Election thereto is sufficient*. And *Dr. Stillingfleet* informs us, That *Cranmer* has declared, *That a Governour could make Priests, as well as Bishops*. And *Mr. Whitaker* tells us, *That there are no Priests now in the Church of Christ, (Pag. 200. adverf. Camp.)* that is, (as he Interprets himself, *Pag. 210.*) *This Name Priest is never in the New Testament peculiarly applied to the Ministers of the Gospel*. And we are not Ignorant, how both King *Edward* the Sixth, and Queen *Elizabeth*, made *Bishops* by their Letters Patents only, (let our *Lambeth-Records* pretend what they will): To Authorize which, 'tis no wonder, if they made the *Scripture* say, *When they had ordained Elders by Election, instead of Priests by Imposition of Hands*; tho' contrary to the Fourth Council of *Carthage*, which enjoys, *That when a Priest takes his Orders, the Bishop Blessing him, and holding his Hand upon his Head, all the Priests also that are Present, hold their Hands by the Bishop's Hand, upon his Head*: So are our *Priests* made at This Day; And so would Now the Clergy of the *Church of England* pretend to be made, if They had but *Bishops* and *Priests* able to make them. For which purpose, They have not only Corrected this Error, in Their Last Translations; but have also gotten the Words, *Bishop* and *Priest*, thrust into Their Forms of *Ordination*: But the Man that wants Hands to work with, is not much better for having Tools.

† 25 of the  
39 Articles.  
  
See Dr.  
Burnet's  
Hist.  
See Stilling.  
Ironicon.  
pag. 392.

Council 3.  
anno 436.  
where Dr.  
Augustin  
was present  
and Sub-  
scribed.

Dr. Bram.  
pag. 96.  
Mason lib. 1

Moreover, Some of our Pretenders to *Priesthood*, would gladly have *Holy Order* to take its place again among the *Sacraments*: And therefore, both *Dr. Bramhall*, and *Mt. Mason*, reckon it for a *Sacrament*, tho' quite contrary to their *Scripture Translators*; who, lest it should be so accounted, do Translate (b) *Gift* instead of *Grace*; lest it should appear, that *Grace* is given in *Holy Orders*. I wonder, They have not Corrected This in Their latter Translations; but, perhaps, They durst not do it, for fear of making it Clash with the 25th. of Their 39. Articles. 'Tis no less to be admired, that since They began to be Enamour'd of *Priesthood*, They have not dislaid that Prophane Intruder, *Elder*, and placed the true Ecclesiastical Word, *Priest*, in the Text. But to this I hear Them object, That our *Latin* Translation hath *Seniores & Majores* ~~etiam~~; and therefore, why may not They also Translate *Elder*? To which I Answer, *That this is nothing to Them, who profess to Translate the Greek, and not Our Latin*; and the *Greek* Word They know is *πρεσβύτερος*, *Presbyteros*. Again, I say, That if They meant no worse than the Old *Latin* Translitor did, They would be as indifferent as He, to have said sometimes *Priest* and *Priesthood*, when He has the Words *Presbyteros* and *Presbyterum*, as We are indifferent in Our Translation, saying, *Seniors* and *Ancients*, when We find it so in *Latin*: Being well assured, that by Sundry Words he meant but One Thing, as in *Greek* it is but One. *St. Hierom* reads, *Pr̄sbyteros ego comp̄sbyter*† (*in 1. ad Gal.*) proving the Dignity of *Priests*: And yet in the 4th. of the *Galatians*, he reads, according to the *Vulgar Latin Text*, *Seniores in vobis rego Confessor & ipse*: whereby it is evident, that *Senior* here, and in the *Acts*, is a *Priest*; and not, on the contrary, *Presbyter*, an *Elder*.

† *St. Hier.*  
*Ep. 89. ad*  
*Ephag.*

(c) In this place they thrust the Word *Minister* into the Text, for an Ecclesiastical Order: So that, tho' they will not have *Bishops Priests* and *Deacons*, yet they would gladly have *Bishops Ministers* and *Deacons*: yet the Word they Translate for *Minister*, is *διάκονος*, *Diakonus*; the very same that, a little after, (d) they Translate *Deacon*. And so because *Bishops* went before in the same Chapter, they have found out three Orders, *Bishops*, *Ministers* and *Deacons*. How poor a Shift is this, that they are forc'd to make the Apostle speak Three things for Two, on purpose to get a place in the *Scripture* for their *Ministers*?—As likewise, in another place \*, on purpose to make room for their *Ministers Wives*, (for there's no living without them) they Translate *Wife* instead of *Woman*, making *St. Paul* say, *Havenot we Power to leat about a Wife?* &c. for which cause they had rather say *Grave* than *Chast*.

\* *1 Cor.*  
ver. 5.

## Heretical Translations

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Malachy, cap. 2. ver. 7.	(a) <i>Labia enim Sacerdotis custodient Scientiam &amp; Legem requirant ex ore ejus quia Angelus Domini Exercitum est.</i>	The Priests Lips shall keep Know- ledge, and they shall seek the Law at his Mouth; because he is the <i>Angel</i> of the Lord of Hosts.	(a) <i>The Priests Lips should keep Knowledge, and they should seek the Law at his Mouth; because he is the Messenger of the Lord of Hosts.</i>	For <i>shall</i> , they Translate <i>should</i> . And for <i>Angel</i> , <i>Messenger</i> in This also.
Apocalips, cap. 2, 3. ver. 8, 12.	Angelo <i>Ephesi Ec- clesiae Scribe.</i>	To the <i>Angel</i> of the Church of Eph- esus, write thou.	To the Messenger of, &c. instead of <i>Angel</i> .	Corrected.
Malachy, cap. 3. ver. 1.	(b) <i>Ecce ego mit- to Angelum meum [νω ἀγγέλον μου] &amp; præparabit viam an- te Faciem meam &amp; Statim veniet ad Templum suum Domi- nator quem vos queri- tis &amp; Angelus Testa- menti quem vos vultis.</i>	Behold, I send mine <i>Angel</i> , and he shall prepare the way before my Face. And the Ruler whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his Temple, even the <i>Angel of the Testament</i> , whom ye wish for.	Instead of <i>Angel</i> , they say <i>Messenger</i> . And for <i>Angel of the Testament</i> , they Tran- slate, <i>Messenger of the Covenant</i> .	The same also they Translate Here, without any Cor- rection.
Matthew, cap. 11. ver. 10.	<i>Hic est enim de qua Scriptum est, ecce ego mitto Angelum meum ante Faciem tuam.</i>	For this is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send mine <i>Angel</i> before thy Face.	For <i>Angel</i> , they say <i>Messenger</i> .	Instead of <i>Angel</i> , they say <i>Messenger</i> .
Luke, cap. 7. ver. 27.	<i>Hic est de quo Scriptum est ecce mit- to Angelum meum, &amp;c.</i>	This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send mine <i>Angel</i> , &c.	----- Behold I send my Messen- ger, &c.	For <i>Angel</i> , <i>Mes- senger</i> .
1 Corinth, cap. 2. ver. 10.	(d) <i>Si quid Dna- vi propter vos in Per- sona Christi [iv τε σωτηρίας εστι]</i>	If I Pardon any thing for you in the Person of Christ.	(d) ----- In the Sight of Christ.	Corrected.

as of the  
39 Articles,  
Rogers's  
Defence of  
the same,  
pag. 155.

(a) Because our Pretended Reformers teach, That Order is not a Sacrament; That it has neither Visible Sign, [What is Imposition of Hands?] nor Ceremony ordain'd of God; nor Form; nor Institution from Christ, (consequently, that it cannot Imprint a Character in the Soul of the Person Ordain'd); They not only avoid the Name Priest, in their Translations; but, the more to derogate from the Privilege and Dignity of Priests, They make the Scripture, in this place, speak quite contrary to the words of the Prophet; as they are read both in the Hebrew and Greek, *וְלֹא־צְרָאֵת תְּשׁוּרָה, בְּקָרְבָּנָה*; where 'tis as plain as can be spoken, that, *The Priests Lips shall keep Knowledge, and they shall seek the Law at his Mouth*; which is a wonderful Privilege given to the Priests of the Old Law, for true determination in Matters of Controversie, and right Expounding of the Law, as we may read more fully in *Deuteronomy* the 17th. where they are commanded, under pain of Death, to stand to the Priests Judgment: Which in this place, (Ver. 4.) *GOD*, by his Prophet *Malachy*, calls, *His Covenant with Levi*, and that He will have it to stand, to wit, in the *New Testament*, where St. Peter has such Privilege for him, and his Successors, that his Faith shall not fail; and where the *Holy Ghost* is President in the Councils of *Bishops* and *Priests*. All which, the Reformers of our Days would Deface and Defeat, by Translating the Words otherwise than the *Holy Ghost* has spoken them. And when the Prophet adds immediately the Cause of this singular Prerogative of the Priest; *Because he is the Angel of the Lord of Hosts* (which is also a wonderful Dignity to be so called); They Translate, *Because he is the Messenger of the Lord of Hosts*. So do They also, in the *Revelations*, call the *Bishops* of the Seven Churches of *Asia*, *Messengers*.

(b) And here, in like manner, they call St. John *Baptist, Messenger*; where the Scripture, no doubt, speaks more Honourably of him, as being *CHRIST*'s Precursor, than of a *Messenger*, which is a term for *Post*s and *Laquies*. The Scripture, I say, speaks more Honourably of him: And our Saviour, in the *Gospel*, telling the People the wonderful Dignities of St. John, and that he was more than a Prophet, cites this place, and gives this reason; *For this is he, of whom it is written, Behold, I send mine Angel before thee: Which St. Hieron calls, Meritorum auξον, The Increase and Augmenting of John's Merits or Privileges.* And St. Gregory says, *He which came to bring tidings of *CHRIST* himself, was worthily call'd an Angel, that in his very Name there might be Dignity: And all the Fathers conceive a great Excellency of this Name Angel; only our Protestants, who measure all Divine Things and Persons by the Line of their Human Understanding, and translate accordingly; making our Saviour say, That John was more than a Prophet, because he was a Messenger.* (c) Yea, where our Blessed Saviour himself is called, *Angelus Testamenti, The Angel of the Testament*; there they translate, *The Messenger of the Covenant*.

St. Hieron  
in Comment.  
in hunc locum.  
St. Greg.  
Hom 6 in  
Exaudi.

St. Hieron translated not *Naveum*, but *Angelus*; and the *Church*, and all *Antiquity*, both Reading and Expounding it as a term of more Dignity and Excellency, Why do the Novelists of our Age, thus boldly disgrace the very *Eloquence* of Scripture, which, by such terms of Amplification, would speak more significantly and emphatically? Why, I say, do they for *Angel* translate *Messenger*? for *Apostle, Legate or Ambassador*, and the like? Doubtless, this is all done to take away, as much as possible, the *Dignity* and *Excellency* of *Priesthood*. Yet, methinks, they should have Corrected this in their Latter Translations, when They began Themselves to aspire to the Title of *Priests*; whose Name, however, they may *Usurp*, yet cannot They hitherto attain to the Authority and Power of *Priesthood*. They are but *Priests* in *Name only*, the *Power* They want; and therefore are pleased to be content with the ordinary Stile of *Messengers*; not yet daring to term Themselves *Angels*, as St. John did the *Bishops* of the Seven Churches of *Asia*.

(d) But, great is the Authority, Dignity, Excellency, and Power of *GOD*'s Priests and *Bishops*: They do *Bind* and *Loose*, and Execute all Ecclesiastical Functions, as in the Person and Power of *CHRIST*, whose Ministers they are. So St. Paul says, *That when he Pardon'd or Releas'd the Penance of the Incestuous Corinthian, he did it in the Person of *CHRIST**; (They falsly translate, *In the Sight of *CHRIST**); that is, as St. Ambrose Expounds it, *In the Name of Christ, In His stead, and as His Vicar and Deputy*: And when he Excommunicated the said Incestuous Person, he said, *He did it in the Name, and with the Virtue of our Lord Jesus *CHRIST**.— And the Fathers of the Council of *Ephesus*\* avouch, *That no Man doubts, yea, 'tis known to all Ages, That Holy and most Blessed Peter, Prince and Head of the Apostles, Pillar of Faith, and Foundation of the Catolick Church, Receiv'd from our Lord Jesus *CHRIST*, the Keys of the Kingdom; and that Power of Loosing and Binding Sins was given him; who, in his Successors, lives and exerciseth Judgment to this very Time, and always.*

1 Cor. 2.  
ver. 10.

1 Cor. 5.  
ver. 4.  
• Part. 2.  
A. 3.

<i>The Book, Chapter, and Verse.</i>	<i>The Vulgar Latin Text.</i>	<i>The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.</i>	<i>Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579</i>	<i>The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.</i>
Matthew, cap. 2. ver. 6.	(c) <i>Ex te enim ex- iet Dux qui Regat Populum meum Israel.</i>	For out of Thee shall come forth the Captain, that shall Rule my People Is- rael.	(e) Instead of <i>Rule</i> , the New-Te- stament, Printed An- no 1580. Translates <i>Feed</i> .	Corrected.
Micah, cap. 5. ver. 2.	לֹה יְהוָה צְדָקָה בְּעָרָה אֵת אֶפְרַיִם בְּעָרָה לְגָתָה.			
I Peter, cap. 2. ver. 13.	(f) <i>Subjecti igitur estate omni hu- manæ Creaturæ nō dīpamīnū nōcū, pro- pter Deum, sive Regi quasi Præcellenti fr- uē Ducibus, &amp;c. [Bæ- sīnū as ūmpīxēnū.]</i>	Be subject there- fore to every Hu- man Creature for God, whether it be to the King as Excelling, &c.	(f) In the latter end of King Henry VIII. and in Edward VI. Times, They translated, <i>Submit your selves unto</i> all manner of Or- dinance of Man, <i>whether it be unto the King, as to the Chief Head.</i>	Submit your selves to every Ordinance of Man, for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the King, as Su- premam.
Acts Apost. cap. 20. ver. 28.	(g) <i>Attendite vo- bis &amp; universo Gregi in quo vos Spiritus Sanctus posuit Epis- copos Regere Eccle- siam Dei.</i> <i>Ἐποκόπτες ποιμανεῖσθαι τοὺς ἐκκλησίας τὸ Θεῖον.</i>	Take heed to your selves, and to the whole Flock, where- in the Holy Ghost hath placed you Bi- shops to Rule the Church of God.	(g) — Where- in the Holy Ghost hath made you O- verseers, to Feed the Congregation of God.	— Wherein the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, to Feed the Church of God.

(e) **I**t is certain, That this is a false Translation; because the Prophets Words (*Mich. 5.* cited by St. *Matthew*) both in *Hebrew* and *Greek*, signify only a *Ruler* or *Governor*, and not a *Pastor* or *Feeder*. Therefore, it is either a great over sight; which is a small matter, in comparison of the least Corruption; or else it is done on purpose; which I the rather think, because they do the like in another place, (*Acts 20.*) as you may see below. And that to suppress the signification of Ecclesiastical Power and Government, that concurs with *Feeding*, first in **CHRIST**, and from Him in his Apostles and Pastors of the Church; both which are here signified in this one *Greek Word*, *μιμαινειν*; to wit, That **CHRIST** our Saviour shall *Rule* and \* *Feed*; yea, He shall *Rule* in a Rod of Iron; And from Him, St. Peter, and the rest, by his Commission given in the same Word, *μιμαινειν*, *Feed* and *Rule* my Sheep; yea, and that in a Rod of Iron: As when He struck *Ananias* and *Sapphira* to Corporal Death; as his Successors do the like Offenders to Spiritual Destruction (unless they Repent) by the Terrible Rod of Excommunication. This is import'd in the double signification of the *Greek Word*, which They, to diminish Ecclesiastical Authority, rather Translate *Feed*, than *Rule* or *Govern*.

\* *Psalm 2.*  
*Apocalip.*  
2. ver. 27.  
3. 28.

(f) To the diminishing of this Ecclesiastical Authority, they Translated this Text of *Scripture*, (in King *Henry VIII.* and King *Edward VI.* Times) *Unto the King as the chief Head* (*1 Pet. 2.*) because then the King had first taken upon him this Title of *Supream Head of the Church*. And therefore they Flattered both Him, and his Young Son, till their Heresie was Planted; making the Holy Scripture say, That the King was the *Chief Head*, [which is all one with *Supream Head*.] But, in Queen *Elizabeth's* Time, being, it seems, better advised in that point, (by *Calvin*; I suppose, and the *Magdeburgenses*, who joynly inveighed against that Title; and *Calvin*, against that, by Name, which was given to *Henry the VIII.*) and because, perhaps, they thought they could be bolder with a *Queen*, than with a *King*; as also, because then they thought their Reformation pretty well established; they began to Suppress this Title in their Translations, and to say, *To the King, as having Preheminence*, and, *To the King, as the Superior*; indeavouring (as may be supposed by this Translation) to Incroach upon that Ecclesiastical and Spiritual Jurisdiction they had formerly granted to the Crown.

But however that be, Let them either justifie their Translation, or confess their Fault: And for the rest, I will refer them to the Words of St. *Ignatius*, who lived in the Apostles Time, and tells us, *That we must first Honour God, then the Bishop, then the King*; because in all things, *Nothing is comparable to God*; and in the Church, *nothing greater than the Bishop, who is Consecrated to God, for the Salvation of the whole World*; and among *Magistrates and Temporal Rulers*, *none is like the King*.

(g) Again, Observe how they here suppress the Name *Bishop*, and translate *Overseers*; which is a Word, that has as much relation to a Temporal Magistrate, as to a Bishop. And this they do, because in King *Edward the VI.* and Queen *Elizabeth's* Time, they had no Episcopal Consecration, but were made only by their Letters Patents \*; which, I suppose, they will not deny, however, when they read of King *Edward the VI.* making *John à Lasco* (a *Polonian*) Overseer or Superintendent, by His Letters Patents; and of their making one another Superintendants, or Pastors at *Frankfort*, by Election; and such only to continue for a time; or so long as themselves, or the Congregation pleased; and then to return again to the state of Private Persons, or Lay-Men; (*Vid. Hist. of the Troubles at Frankfort* †) and also of K. *Edward's* giving Power and Authority to *Cranmer*; And how *Cranmer*, when he made *Priests*, (by Election only, I suppose, because they were to continue no longer than the King pleased; whereas *Priests* truly Consecrated, are mark'd with an Indelible Character) pretended no other Authority for such Act, but only what he received from the King, by Virtue of his Letters Patents. *Fox To. 2. An. 1546, 1547.*

And we have reason to judge, That *Mas. Parker*, and the rest of Queen *Elizabeth's* New Bishops, were no otherwise Made, than by the Queens Letters Patents; seeing, that the *Form*, devis'd by King *Edw. VI.* being Repeal'd by Queen *Mary*, was not again reviv'd till the 8 of Q. *Eliz.* [ To say nothing of the Invalidity of the said *Form*; as having neither the Name of *Bishop* nor *Priest* in it ], The like doubt of their Consecration, arises from the many and great Objections, made by *Catholick Writers* \*, against their pretended *Lambeth-Records* and *Register*: As also from the Consecrators of *M. Parker*, viz. *Barlow*, *Scorey*, &c. who we cannot believe to have been Consecrated themselves, unless first they can shew us Records of *Barlow's* Consecration, and secondy, tell us, by what *Form* of Consecration *Coverdale* and *Scorey* were made Bishops; the *Rom. Cath.* Ordinal having been Abrogated, and the New One not yet devised; at the Time that *Mas. Parker* says, they were Consecrated; which was, *Aug. 30. 1551.* And as for the *Suffragan*, there is such a difference about his Name †; some calling him *John*, some *Richard*; and about the place where he liv'd; some calling him *Suffragan of Bedford* \*, some of *Dover* †; that 'tis doubtful, there was no such Person present at that *Lambeth Ceremony*. But these things being fitter for another Treatise, (which, I hope, e're long, you may be presented with) I shall say no more of them in this place.

*Calvin in*  
c. 7. *Amos.*  
*Magdeb.*  
in *Prat.*  
*Cent. 7. fa*  
9, 10, 11.

*Ep. 7. as*  
*Syngrensis*

\* *Let. Pat.*  
*Wienb.*  
p. 71.

*Fox To. 2.*

in *Ed. 6.*

*Regist. Ec-*  
*cles. Lond.*  
*Calvinus*

p. 327.

+ *Hist. Frz.*

p. 51, 50,

62, 63, 72,

73, 74, 87,

97, 99, 125,

126, &c.

\* *Finch.*

*Dr. Champ.*

*Nullity of*

*the English*

*Clergy. Pro.*

*decons. &c.*

+ *See Dr.*

*Brahmhal,*

*p. 98.*

\* *Mas. Parker*,

*Brahm. &c.*

+ *Dr. Pilk.*

*Ep. of de*

*Consecrat.*

*Minist.*

## Heretical Translations

<i>The Book, Chapter, and Verse.</i>	<i>The Vulgar Latin Text.</i>	<i>The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.</i>	<i>Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.</i>	<i>The last Translation of the Protestant Bible, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.</i>
1 Corinth. cap. 9. ver. 5.	(a) <i>Numquid non habemus potestatem Mulierem, Sororem</i> [ἀλλα γυναῖκα] <i>circumducendi, &amp;c.</i>	Have not we power to lead about a <i>Woman</i> , a <i>Sister</i> ? &c.	(a) <i>Have we not power to lead about a Wife, a Sister?</i> &c.	Instead of <i>Woman</i> , they Translate <i>Wife</i> here also.
Philipians, cap. 4. ver. 3.	(b) <i>Etiam rogo &amp; te Germane Compar</i> [αὐτῷ γέννα] [αὐτῷ γέννα]	Yea, and I beseech thee, my sincere <i>Companion</i> .	(b) <i>For Companion, they say, Yoke-Fellow.</i>	---- <i>Yoke-Fellow.</i>
Hebrews, cap. 13. ver. 4.	(c) <i>Honorabile Connubium in omnibus</i> [τιμός γαμός in omnī] <i>&amp; Thorus immaculatus.</i>	Marriage Honourable in All, and the Bed undefiled.	(c) <i>Wedlock is honourable among all Men, &amp;c.</i>	Marriage is Honourable in All.
Matthew, cap. 19. ver. 11.	(d) <i>Qui dixit illis, Non omnes capiunt verbum istud,</i> [καὶ μέντης καρπόν.] <i>sed quibus datum est.</i>	Who said to them, <i>Not All take this Word</i> ; but they to whom it is given.	(d) --- <i>all Men cannot receive this saying, &amp;c.</i>	---- <i>All Men cannot receive this saying, &amp;c.</i>
Matthew, cap. 19. ver. 12.	(e) <i>Et sunt Eunuchi qui seipso castraverunt</i> [εὐνύχιοι οἴτης εὐνύχοι εαυτούς.] <i>propter Regnum Cœlorum.</i>	And there are <i>Eunuchs, which have Gelled themselves</i> for the Kingdom of Heaven.	(e) <i>There are some Chast, which have made themselves Chast for the Kingdom of Heaven.</i>	Corrected.

(a) **F**, says St. Hierom, the Laity, or any of the Faithful, cannot Pray, unless he forbear Conjugation, Priests, to whom it belongs to Offer Sacrifices for the People, are always to Pray; if to Pray always, therefore perpetually to live Single or Unmarried. But our late Pretended Reformers, the more to Prophane the Sacred Order of Priesthood, to which Continency and Single Life has always been annex'd in the New Testament, and to make it meerly Laical and Popular, they will have all to be Marryed Men; yea, those that have Vow'd to the contrary: and it is a great Credit, among them, for Apostate Priests to take Wives. And therefore, by their falsly corrupting this Text of St. Paul, they will needs have him to say, That He, and the rest of the Apostles, *Led their Wives about with them*, (as K Edward the Sixth's German-Apostles did theirs, when they came first into England, at the Call of the Lord Protector Seymour;) whereas the Apostle says nothing else, but a *Woman*, a *Sister*; meaning such a Christian *Woman*, as follow'd CHRIST, and the Apostles, to find, and maintain them of their Substance. So does St. Hierom Interpret it, and St. Augustin also; both directly proving, That it cannot be translated *Wife*: (b) Neither ought this Text to be translated *Yoke-Fellow*, as our Novelists do, on purpose to make it found in English, *Man and Wife*. Indeed, *Calvin* and *Beza* translate it in the *Masculine Gender*, for a *Companion*. And St. Theophilact, a Greek Father, saith, *That if St. Paul had spoken to a Woman, it should have been γυνα, in Greek*. St. Paul says himself, He had no *Wife*, (1 Cor. 7.) And I think we have a little more reason to believe him, than those, who would gladly have him Marryed, on purpose to cloak the Sensuality of a few fallen Priests. In the first Chapter of the *Letter*, ver. 14. *Beza* translates, (*Cum Uxoribus*) *With their Wives*, because he would have all the Apostles there, reckoned for Marryed Men; whereas the Word is, [*Cum Mulieribus*] *With the Women*, as our English Translations also have it; because, in this place, they were ashame to follow their Master *Beza*.

(c) Again, For the Marriage of Priests, and all sorts of Men indifferently, they corrupt this Text, making two Falsifications in one Verse: The one is, *Among all Men*: The other, That they make it an affirmative Speech, by adding [*Is*;] whereas the Apostles Words are these, *Marriage Honourable in All, and the Bed undefiled*; which is rather an Exhortation; as if he should say, *Let Marriage be Honourable in All, and the Bed undefiled*; as appears, both by that which goes before, and that which follows immediately; all which are Exhortations. Let, therefore, *Protestants* give us a reason out of the Greek Text, why they translate the Words following, by way of Exhortation, *Let your Conversation be without Covetousness*; and not these Words also, in like manner, *Let Marriage be Honourable in All*? The Greek in both, is all one Phrase and Speech.

(d) Moreover, It is against the Profession of *Continency* in Priests and others, that they translate our Saviours Words of *Single Life*, and *Unmarried State*, thus, *All Men cannot*, &c. as tho' it were impossible to live *Continency*; where CHRIST said not, *That all Men cannot*; but, *All Men DO not receive this saying*. St. Augustin says, *VVhoever have not this Gift [of Chastity] given them, 'tis either because they will not have it, or because they faulfil not that which they will: And they that have this word, have it of G O D, and their own Free-will*.

*This Gift*, says *Origen* \*, is given to all that Ask for it.

(e) Nor do they translate this Text exactly, nor, perhaps, with a sincere Meaning; for, if there be Chastity in *Marriage*, as well as in the *Single Life*, as *Paphnutius*, the Confessor, most truly said, and as Themselves are wont often to alledge; then their Translation doth nothing express our Saviours meaning, when they say, *There are some Chast, which have made themselves Chast, &c.* for a Man might say, All do so, who live Chastly in Matrimony. But our Saviour speaks of such as have Gilded themselves for the Kingdom of Heaven; not by cutting off these Parts which belong to Generation, for that were an Horrible and Mortal Sin; but by making themselves unable and impotent to Generation, by *Promise*, and *Vow* of *perpetual Chastity*, which is a Spiritual Geling of themselves.

St. Basil calls the Marriage of the Clergy, *Fornication*, and not *Matrimony*. — Of Canonical Persons, says he, *the Fornication must not be reputed Matrimony*, because the *Conjunction of these is altogether Prohibited*; for this is altogether profitable for the Security of the Church. And in his Epistle to a certain Prelate, he cites these words out of the Council of Nice; *'Tis by the great Council forbidden, in all cases whatsoever, That it should be Lawful for a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, or for any whatsoever, that are in Orders, to have a Woman live with them; except only their Mother, Sister, or Aunt, or such Persons as are void of all suspicion*.

St. Hierom  
lib. contr.  
frin. c. 19.  
1 Cor. 7. 33,  
35.

Lib. 1. ad  
zebus.  
Jovinien  
de op. mon.  
c. 4.  
Lab. 2. c 24.

Lib. de  
Gratia &  
Libr. Ar-  
bitr. c. 4.  
\* Trab. 7.  
in Matth.

St. Basil  
Ep. 1. ad  
Amphilioc.  
Ep. 17. ad  
Paregor.  
Prefct.  
Cone. Nic.  
in Cod.  
Gra. Can.  
3.

## Heretical Translations

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Acts Apost. cap. 19. ver. 3.	(a) <i>In quo [eis n] ergo Baptizati estis? qui dixerunt In Iohannis Baptismate.</i>	<i>In what then were you Baptized? who said, In John's Baptism.</i>	(a) Unto what then were you Baptized? And they said, Unto John's Baptism.	<i>Unto what then were ye Baptized? And they said, Unto John's Baptism.</i>
Titus cap. 3. ver. 5, 6.	(b) <i>Non ex operibus justitiae que fecimus nos, sed secundum suam Misericordiam salvos nos fecit, per lavacrum Regenerationis &amp; Renovationis Spiritus Sancti; Quem effudit in nos abunde per Jesum Christum Salvatorem nostrum.</i>	Not by the works of Justice, which we did; but according to his Mercy, He hath saved us; by the Laver of Regeneration, and Renovation of the Holy Ghost, <i>Whom he hath poured upon us abundantly, by Jesus Christ our Saviour.</i>	(b) —— <b>By the Fountain of the Regeneration of the Holy Ghost</b> , which he shed on us, &c.	Not by works of Righteousness, which we have done; but according to his Mercy, he saved us; by the <i>Washing</i> of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, <i>Which he shed on us, &amp;c.</i>

In the beginning of the Reformation, they not only took away Five of the Seven Sacraments, but also depriv'd the rest of all *Grace, Virtue, and Efficacy*; making them no more than *Poor and Beggarly Elements*; at the most, no better than those of the *Jewish Law*. And this, because they would not have them any thing helpful, or necessary towards our *Salvation*; for the obtaining of which, they held and asserted, *That Faith alone was sufficient*.

For which reason, *Beza* was not content to say, with the Apostle, (Rom. 4. ver. 11.) *That Circumcision was a Seal of the Justice of Faith*; but because he thought that term too small for the Dignity of Circumcision, he (to use his own Words) *gladly avoids it*; putting the *Verb* instead of the *Noun*, [ *Quod obsignaret*, for *Sigillum*. ] And, in his Annotations upon the same place, he declares the reason of his so doing to be, *The Dignity of Circumcision equal with any Sacrament in the New Testament*: His words are, *What could be more magnifically spoken of any Sacrament? Therefore, they that put a real difference between the Sacraments of the Old Testament and Ours, never seem to have known how far Christ's Office extendeth*: which he says, not to magnifie the *Old*, but disgrace the *New*.

This is also the cause, why our First English Translators corrupted this (a) place in the *Acts*, to make no difference between *John's Baptism*, and *Christ's*, saying, *Unto what then were you Baptized? And they said, Unto John's Baptism*. Which *Beza* would have to be spoken of *John's Doctrine*, and not of his *Baptism* in Water; as if it had been said, *What Doctrine do ye Profess?* and they said, *John's*; Whereas, indeed, the Question is, *In what then? or, Wherein were you Baptized?* and they said, *In John's Baptism*: As if they would say, We have receiv'd *John's Baptism*, but not the *Holy Ghost*, as yet: Whence immediately follows, *Then they were Baptized in the Name of Jesus*; and after *Imposition of Hands*, *The Holy Ghost came upon them*: whence appears, the Insufficiency of *John's Baptism*; and the great difference between *It* and *CHRIST's*. And this so much troubles the *Bezites*, that *Beza* himself, expresses his Grief in these Words, *It is not necessary, that wheresoever there is mention of John's Baptism, we should think it the very Ceremony of Baptism: Therefore they, who gather that John's Baptism differs from CHRIST's, because These, a little after, are said to be Baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ, have no sure Foundation*; See his Annotations in *Acts 19*. Thus he endeavours to take away the Foundation of this Catholick conclusion, *That John's Baptism differs, and is far Inferior to Christ's*.

*Beza* confesses, That the *Greek* [ *εἰς τὸν* ] is often us'd for *wherein* or *wherewith*; as it is in the *Vulgar Latin*, and *Erasmus*; but he, and his followers, think it signifies not so here; tho', but the *Second Verse* after, (Ver. 5.) the very same *Greek Phrase* [ *εἰς τὸ ὄντος* ] is by them Translated [ *In* ]; where they say, *That they were Baptized In* [ *not Unto* ] *the Name of Jesus Christ*.

But no wonder, if they *Disgrac'd* the *Baptism* of *CHRIST*, when some \* of them durst presume to take it quite away, by Interpreting these words of the *Gospel*; *Unless a Man be Born again of Water, and the Spirit, &c.* in this manner, *Unless a Man be Born again of Water, that is, the Spirit*; as if by *Water*, in this place, were only meant the *Spirit Allegorically*, and not material *Water*: As tho' our Saviour had said to *Nicodemus*, *Unless a Man be Born again of Water, I mean of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*. To which purpose, *Calvin* as falsely translates the *Apostle's words* to *Titus* (b), thus, *Per lavacrum regenerationis Sp. Sancti, QUOD, effudit in nos abunde*; making the *Apostle* say, *That God poured the Water of Regeneration upon us abundantly*; that is, *the Holy Ghost*. And, lest we should not understand him, he tells us, in his *Commentary* on this place, *That the Apostle, speaking of Water poured out abundantly, speaks not of Material Water, but of the Holy Ghost*: Whereas the *Apostle* makes not *Water*, and the *Holy Ghost* all one; but most plainly distinguishes them; not saying, that *Water* was poured out upon us (as they would infer, by translating it, *Which he shed*) but the *Holy Ghost*, Whom he has poured out upon us abundantly: So that here is meant both the *Material Water*, or *Washing of Baptism*, and the *Effect* thereof, which is the *Holy Ghost* poured out upon us.

But, if I blame our English Translators, in this place, for making it indifferent, either, *Which Fountain*, or *Which Holy Ghost he shed*, &c. they will tell me, that the *Greek* is also indifferent: But, if we demand of them, whether the *Holy Ghost*, or rather a *Fountain of Water*, may be said to be *Shed*, they must doubtless confess, not the *Holy Ghost*, but *Water*: And consequently, their translating, *Which he shed*, instead of, *Whom he poured out*, would have it meant the *Fountain of Water*; thereby agreeing with *Calvin's Translation*, and *Beza's Commentary*: [For *Beza* in his Translation, refers it to the *Holy Ghost*, as *Catholicks* do.]

25. of the  
39 Articles.

\* *Beza in*  
4. Jo. ver.  
10. & in  
Tit. c. 3. v.  
5.

*Calvin's*  
*Translation*  
*in Tit. c. 3.*  
*ver. 5.*

## Heretical Translations

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
St. James, cap. 5. ver. 16.	(a) Confitemini [ἰξωλογῆσθε] ergo al- ter utrum Peccata vestra.	Confess, therefore, your Sins one to a- nother.	(a) Acknowledge your Faults one to another.	Confess your Faults, &c.
St. Matth. cap. 11. ver. 21. Et Lucæ, cap. 10. ver. 13.	(b) — Si in Tyro & Sidone factæ essent virtutes quæ factæ sunt in vobis olim in Cilicio & Cinere Pœ- nitentiam egissent. [μετριῶντο.]	— If in Tyre and Sidon had been wrought the Mirac- les that have been done in you, They had done Penance in Sack-Cloath and Ashes, long e're now.	(b) — Beza in all his Translations has, — They had amended their Lives. And our other Translations say, They would have Repented.	— Instead of, They had done Penance; they say, They would have Repented.
St. Matth. cap. 3. ver. 2.	Pœnitentiam agi- te appropinquabit e- niam Regnum Cœlorum.	Do Penance, for the Kingdom of Hea- ven is at hand.	Repent, for the Kingdom of Hea- ven is at hand.	Repent, &c.
St. Lucæ, cap. 3. ver. 3.	— Predicans Bap- tismum Pœnitentiae.	— Preaching the Baptism of Penance.	— Preaching the Baptism of Repentance.	— Preaching the Baptism of Repen- tance.
St. Lucæ, cap. 3. ver. 8.	Facite ergo fructus dignos Pœnitentiae.	Yield, therefore, Fruits worthy of Pe- nance.	— Worthy of Repentance. Beza says, Do Fruits meet for them that amend their lives.	— Fruit worthy of Repentance.
Acts Apost. cap. 2. ver. 38.	Petrus vero ad il- los Pœnitentiam (in quit) agite & Bap- tizetur, unusquisque ve- strum in nomine Jesu Christi.	But Peter said to them, Do Penance, and be every one of you Baptized, in the Name of Jesus Christ.	— Repent, and be every one of you Baptized, &c.	— Repent, and be Baptized, &c.

(4) **T**O avoid this Term [Confession], especially in this place, (whence the Reader might easily gather Sacramental Confession), they thus falsify the Text. It is said, a little before, *If any be Sick, let him bring in the Priests, &c.* And then it follows, *Confess your Sins, &c.* But they, to make sure work, say, *Acknowledge*, instead of *Confess*; and for *Priests, Elders*; and for *Sins*, they had rather say, *Faults*; [*Acknowledge your Faults*] to make it sound, among the Ignorant common People, as different as they can, from the usual Catholick Phrase, *Confess your Sins*. What mean they by this? If this Acknowledging of *Faults* one to another, before Death, be indifferently to be made to all Men; why do they appoint in their *Common-Prayer Book*\* (as it seems, out of this place), That the Sick Person shall make a special Confession to the Minister; and he shall Absolve him in the very same Form of Absolution that *Catholick Priests* use in the *Sacrament of Penance*? — And again, seeing themselves acknowledge Forgiveness of Sins by the Minister, why do they not reckon *Penance*, of which *Confession* is a part, amongst the *Sacraments*? But, I suppose, when they translated their Bibles, they were of the same Judgment with the Ministers of the Diocels of *Lincoln*, who Petitioned to have the words of *Absolution* blotted out of the *Common-Prayer Book*: But when they Visit the Sick, they are of the Judgment of *Roman Catholicks*, who, at this day, hold *Confession* and *Absolution* necessary to Salvation, as did also the *Primitive Christians*: witness *St. Basil*; *Sins must necessarily be opened unto them, unto whom the Dispensation of God's Mysteries is committed*. *St. Ambrose*; *If thou defirest to be justified, confess thy Sin; For a shame-faced Confession of Sins, dissolves the Knot of Iniquity*.

\* Visitation of the Sick.

Survey of the Common Prayer Book.  
S. Basil, in Regula brevior Interrogatione 288.  
S. Ambro. lib. de penit. cap. 6.

St. Basil in Psalm 29.  
St. Aug. Hom. 27.  
Incr 50 H. Et Ep. 108.  
Sozom. ib. 7. c. 15.  
See S. Hieron. in Epitaph. Fabiola.

Socrat. lib. 5. c. 19.

† Council Laodicea Can. 2, Can. 9, & 13.  
‡ Council Nicen. Can. 12.  
S. Basil. Cap. 1. ad Amphilius

St. Aug. Ep. 108.

As for *Penance*, and *Satisfaction* for Sins, they utterly deny it, upon the Heresie of, *Only Faith Justifying, and Saving a Man*. *Beza* protests, That he avoids these terms, *μετάνοια, Parantentia, and μετανοήτης, Parantentiam agit*, of purpose: And says, That in translating these Greek words, he will always use, *Repiscensia*, and *Repiscite*, *Amendment of Life*, and *Amend your Lives*. And our English Bibles, to this day, dare not venture on the word *Penance*, but only *Repentance*; which is not only far different from the Greek Word, but even from the very circumstances of the Text; as is evident from those of *St. Math. 11.* and *Luke 10.* where these words, *Sack-Cloth* and *Ashes*, cannot but signify more than the word *Repentance*, or *Amendment of Life* can be drawn to; as is plain from these words of *St. Basil*, *Sack cloth makes for Penance; for the Fathers, in Old Time, sitting in Sack-clothes and Ashes, did Penance*. Do not *St. John Baptist*, and *St. Paul*, plainly signify *Penitential Works*, when they exhort us to do *Fruits worthy of Penance*? Which *Penance* *St. Augustin* thus declares, *There is a more grievous, and more mournful Penance, whereby properly they are called in the Church, that are Penitents; remov'd also from partaking the Sacrament of the Altar*. And *Sozomen*, in his Ecclesiastical History, says, *In the Church of Rome, there is a manifest and known place for the Penitents, and in it they stand Sorrowful; and as it were Mourning; and when the Sacrifice is ended, being not made Partakers thereof, with Weeping and Lamentations they cast themselves flat on the Ground: Then the Bishop, Weeping also with Compassion, lifts them up; and after a certain time enjoy'd, Absolves them from their PENANCE*. *This the Priests or Bishops of Rome keep, from the very Beginning, even until our Time*.

Not only *Sozomen*, but *Socrates* also, and all the Ancient Fathers, when they speak of *Penitents*, that *Confessed* and *Lamented* their *Sins*, and were *enjoy'd* *Penance*, and *perform'd* it, did always express it in the said Greek Words; which, therefore, are prov'd most evidently to signify *Penance*, and doing *Penance*. Again, when the Ancient Council of *Laodicea*† says, That the time of *Penance* should be given to Offenders, according to the proportion of the Fault: And that such shall not Communicate till a certain Time; but after they have *Done Penance*, and *Confess'd* their Fault, then to be *Receiv'd*: And when the First Council of *Nice* speaks about shortning or prolonging the days of *Penance*: When *St. Basil* speaks after the same sort: When *St. Chrysostome* calls the *Sack-cloth* and *Fasting* of the *Ninevites*, for certain days, *Tos diuum Pænitentiam, So many days of Penance*: In all these places, I would demand of our Translators of the *English Bible*, if all these Speeches of *Penance*, and *doing Penance*, are not express'd by the said Greek Words? And I would ask them, Whether in these places, where there is mention'd a Prescript time of *Satisfaction* for *Sin*, by such and such *Penal* means, they will translate *Repentance*, and *Amendment of Life*, *Only*? — Moreover, the *Latin Church*, and all the Ancient Fathers thereof, have always read, as the *Vulgar Latin* Interpreter translates, and do all expound the same *Penance*, and *doing Penance*: For example, see *St. Augustin*, amongst others; where you will find it plain, that he speaks of *Painful or Penitential Works*, for *satisfaction of Sins*.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
St. Luke, cap. 1. ver. 28.	(a) <i>Ave gratia plena, Dominus tecum,</i> [αναγεννησαί σε σε ράμαντα]	Hail, full of Grace, our Lord is with thee.	(a) Hail, Thou that art freely be- loved. In Bib. 1577. Thou that art in high favour.	Hail, Thou that art highly favoured, our Lord is with thee.
St. Matth. cap. 1. ver. 25.	(b) <i>Et vocavit nomen ejus Iesum.</i> [εἰδίπλωτον οὐρανού ιησού]	And called His Name Jesus.	(b) And he cal- led his Name Je- sus.	And <i>He</i> called his Name Jesus.
Genesis, cap. 3. ver. 15.	(c) <i>Ipsa conteret caput tuum, &amp; tu infidiaberis calcaneo eius.</i>	She shall bruise thy Head in pieces, and thou shalt lie in wait for Her Heel.	(c) It shall bruise thy Head, and thou shalt bruise His Heel.	It shall bruise thy Head, and thou <i>shalt</i> bruise his Heel.
II St. Peter, cap. 1. ver. 15.	(d) <i>Dabo autem operam &amp; frequenter habere vos post obitum meum, ut horum me- moriām faciatuſ.</i>	And I will do my endeavour, you to have often after my Decease also, that you may keep a Memory of these things.	(d) I will en- deavour, that you may be able, after my Decease, to have these things always in remem- brance.	I will endeavour, that you may be able after my Decease, to have these things al- ways in remem- brance.
Psalm 138. Eng. Bib. 139. ver. 17.	(e) <i>Nimis honori- ficati sunt amici tui, Deus; Nimis confor- tatus est principatus eorum</i> [מְאֹד־אָמַרְתִּי אֶל־אֲמַרְתִּי]	Thy Friends, O God, are become ex- ceeding Honourable; their Princedome is exceedingly strength- ened.	(e) How dear are thy Councils (or Thoughts) to me? O how great is the Summ of them?	How precious also are thy Thoughts unto me? O God! How great is the Summ of them.

(a) **T**HE most B. Virgin, and Glorious Mother of **CHRIST**, has, by GOD's Holy Church, always been Honoured with most Magnificent Titles and Addresses: One of the first Four General Councils, gives Her the Transcendental Title of the Mother of **GOD**. And by St. Cyril of *Alexandria*, She is saluted in these words, *Hail, Holy Mother of GOD, Rich Treasure of the World, Ever shining Lamp, Crown of Purity, and Sceptre of true Doctrine; by Thee the Holy Trinity is every where Blessed and Adored, the Heavens Exult, Angels rejoice, and Devils are Chased from us: Who so surpasses in Eloquence, that he is able to say enough to the Glory of Mary? Yea, the Angel Gabriel is Commissioned from GOD, to Address himself to Her with this Salutation, HAIL, FULL OF GRACE.* Since which time, what has ever been more common, and, at this day, more general and usual in all Christian Countries, than in the *Ave Maria*, to say, *Gratia Plena, Full of Grace?* But, in our miserable Land, that Holy Prayer, which every Child us'd to say, is not only Banish'd, but the very Text of *Scripture* where our Blessed Lady was by the Angel saluted by, *Hail, full of Grace*, they have chang'd into another manner of Salutation, *viz. Hail, thou that art freely Beloved, or, in high Favour.* I would glad'y know of them, why This, or That, or any other thing, rather than *Hail, full of Grace?* St. John Baptist was full of the *Holy Ghost*, even from his Birth. St. Stephen was full of *Grace*; why may not then our Lady be called *Full of Grace*, who, as St. Ambrose says, *Only obtained the Grace which no other Woman deserved, To be replenished with the Author of Grace?*

If they say, The Greek Word does not so signify; I must ask them, why they translate *Ulcerosus*, *Full of Sores*, and will not translate, *Gratiosa*, *Full of Grace?* Let them tell us what difference there is in the *Nature* and *Significancy* of these two Words. If *Ulcerosus* (as *Beza* translates it) be *Full of Sores*, why is not *Gratiosa* (as *Erasmus* translates it) *Full of Grace?* seeing that all such Adjectives in *osus* signify *Fulness*, as *Periculosis*, *Eruminosus*, &c. as every School-Boy knows. What Syllable is there in this Word, that seems to make it signify *freely Beloved?* St. *Chrysostome*, and the Greek Doctors, that should best know the nature of this Greek Word, say, That it signifies to make *Gracious* and *Acceptable*. St. *Athanasius*, a Greek Doctor, says, That our Blessed Lady had this Title, *Gratiosa*, because the *Holy Ghost* descended into Her, filling Her with all *Graces* and *Vertues*. And St. *Hierom* reads *Gratia Plena*, and says plainly, She was so Saluted, *Full of Grace*, because she Conceived Him in whom all fulness of the Deity dwelt Corporally.

(b) Again, To take from the Holy Mother of GOD, what Honour they can, They translate, *That He, (viz. Joseph) called his Name JESUS:* And why not *She*, as well as *He?* For in St. *Luke*, the Angel saith to our Lady also, *THOU shalt call his Name JESUS.* Have we not much more reason to think that the B. *Virgin*, the Natural Mother of our Saviour, gave him the Name, *JESUS*, than *Joseph*, his reputed Father; seeing also St. *Matthew*, in this place, limits it neither to *Him* nor *Her*? And the Angel reveal'd the Name first unto Her, saying, *That She should so call Him.* And the Hebrew Word, *Esa. 7. whereunto the Angel alludes*, is the Feminine Gender; and by the Great *Rabbins* referr'd unto *Her*, saying expressly, in their *Commentaries*, *Et vocabit ipsa Puella, &c. And the Maid her self shall call His Name JESUS.*

(c) How ready our New Controulers of Antiquity, and the approved Ancient *Latin Translation*, are to find Fault with this Text, *Gen. 3. She shall bruise thy Head, &c.* because it appertains to our B. *Lady's* Honour; saying, That all Ancient Fathers read *I, sum*: When, on the contrary, St. *Chrysostome*, St. *Ambrose*, St. *Augustin*, St. *Gregory*, St. *Bede*, St. *Bernard*, and many others, read *Ipsa*, as the *Latin Text* now does. And tho' some have read otherwise; Yet, whether we read, *She shall bruise, or Her Seed*, that is, Her Son, *Christ Jesus*, we attribute no more, nor no less to *Christ*, nor to his *Mother*, by this reading, or by that; as you may see, if you please to read the Annotations upon this place, in the *Doway Bible*. *I have spoke of this in the Preface.*

(d) Where the *Scripture*, in the Original, is ambiguous and indifferent to divers Senses, it ought not to be restrained or limited by Translation, unless there be a mere necessity, when it can hardly express the ambiguity of the Original: As for Example, In this where St. Peter speaks so ambiguously, either that he will remember them after his Death, or that they shall remember him. But the *Calvinists* refrain the Sense of this place, without any necessity; and that against the Prayer and Intercession of Saints for us, contrary to the Judgment of some of the Greek Fathers, who concluded from it, *That the Saints in Heaven, remember us on Earth, and make Intercession for us.*

(e) In fine, This Verse of the *Psalms*, which is by the Church, and all Antiquity, read thus, and both Sung and said in Honour of the Holy Apostles, agreeably to that in another *Psalms*, *Thou shalt appoint them Priests over all the Earth.* They translate contrary both to the *Hebrew*, and the *Greek*, which is altogether according to the said Ancient *Latin Translation*, *[How are the Heads of them strengthen'd, or their Princes]*: And this they do, on purpose to distract from the Honour of the Apostles and Holy Saints.

Conc. Eth  
cap. 23.

St. Luke 1.  
ver. 18.

St. Luke, 1.  
ver. 15.  
Act. 7. v. 8.

Luke 16.  
ver. 20.

St. Chrys.  
Comment  
in Ep. 1.  
St. Athan.  
de S. Deipha.  
St. Hierom.  
in Ep. 140.  
in Expis.  
Psal. 44.

Rabbi A.  
braham, &  
Rabbi Da.  
vid.  
See the An.  
notas. upon  
this place  
in the Do.  
way Bible.

Occum. in  
Cron. Gag.  
neces in  
hunc locum  
Psal. 44.

## Heretical Translations

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Hebrews, cap. 11. ver. 21.	(a) <i>Fide Jacob moriens singulos filiorum Joseph benedixit, &amp; adoravit fastigium virgæ ejus.</i> [περούνων ἡνὸς ἀπορτῆς πατέρα ἀντεῖ.]	By Faith, Jacob dying, blessed every one of the Sons of Joseph, and Adored the top of his Rod.	(a) —— And leaning on the end of his Staff, Worshipped God.	By Faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed both the Sons of Joseph, and Worshipped, leaning upon the top of his Staff.
Genesis, cap. 47. ver. 31.	(b) <i>Adoravit Israel Deum, conversus ad Lectuli caput.</i> הָרְאָה שָׁמָן יְהוָה	Israel Adored God, turning to the Bed-head.	(b) Israel Worshipped God towards the Bed-head.	And Israel Bowed himself upon the Bed-head.
Psalm, 98. ver. 5. Eng. Bib. 99.	Exaltate Dominum Deum nostrum, & adorate scabellum pedum ejus, quoniam sanctum est.	Exalt the Lord our God, and adore ye the Foot-stool of his Feet, because it is Holy.	Exalt the Lord our God, and fall down before his Foot-stool, for he is Holy.	Exalt the Lord our God, and Worship at his Foot-stool, for he is Holy.
Psalm 131. ver. 7. Eng. Bib. 132.	Introibimus in tabernaculum ejus, Adorabimus in loco, ubi steterunt pedes ejus.	We will enter into his Tabernacle, we will adore in the place where his Feet stood.	— We will fall down before his Foot-stool.	We will go into his Tabernacles, we will Worship at his Foot-stool.

THE Sacred Council of Trent decrees, that, *The Images of CHRIST, of the Virgin Mother of GOD, and of other Saints, are to be Had and Retained, especially in Churches; and that due Honour and Worship is to be Imparted unto them: Not for that any Divinity is believed to be in them; or Virtue, for which they are to be Worshipped; or that any thing is to be beg'd of them; or that Hope is to be put in them; as, in Times past, the Pagans did, who put their Trust in Idols; but because the Honour which is exhibited to them, is refer'd to the first Pattern, which they resemble: So that, by the Images which we Kiss, and before which we uncover our Heads, and Kneel, we Adore CHRIST and His Saints, whose Likeness they bear.* And the Second Council of Nice, which confirm'd the Ancient Reverence due to Sacred Images, tells us, *That these Images the Faithful salute with a Kiss, and give an Honorary Worship to them, but not the true LATRIA or Divine Worship, which is according to Faith, and can be given to none besides GOD himself.* Between which degrees of Worship [ *Latria & Dulia* ] Protestants are so loath to make any distinction, that, in this place (a), they restrain the Scripture to the Sence of One Doctor; insomuch that they make the Commentary of St. *Augustin* (peculiar to him alone) the very Text of Scripture, in their Translation; thereby excluding all other Sences and Expositions of other Fathers; who either Read and Expound, that Jacob *Ador'd the top of Joseph's Scepter*; or else, that *He Adored towards the top of his Scepter*: Besides which two Sences, there is no other Interpretation of this place, in all Antiquity, but in St. *Augustin* only, as *Bез* himself confesses: And here they add two words more than are in the Greek Text, [ *Leaning and God* ] forcing *ἀντὸν* to signifie *ἀντὸς*, which may be, but is as rare as *Virge ejus*, for *Virge sue*; and turning the other words clear out of their Order, Place, and form of Construction, which they must needs have correspondent and answerable to the *Hebrew Text*, from whence they were translated; which *Hebrew* words themselves translate in this order, *He Worshipped towards the Beds-head*; and if so, according to the *Hebrew*, then did he worship *toward the top of his Scepter*, according to the *Greek*; the difference of both being only in these words, *Scepter* and *Bed*; because the *Hebrew* is ambiguous to both, and not in the Order and Construction of the Sentence.

But why is it, that they thus boldly add in one place, and take away in another? Why do they add [ *Leaned and God* ] in one Text, and totally suppress [ *Worshipped God* ] in another? Is it not because they are afraid, lest those Expressions might warrant and confirm the Catholick and Christian manner of Adoring our Saviour *CHRIST* toward the *Holy Cross*, or before his Image, the *Crucifix*, the *Altar*, &c.? And tho' they make so much of the *Greek Particle* [ *ἐν* ] as to translate it, *Leaning upon*, rather than *towards*; yet the Ancient *Greek Fathers* \* put so little force in it, that they expounded and read the Text, as if it were of Phrase only, and not of any signification at all; saying, *Jacob adored Joseph's Scepter*; *The People of Israel adored the Temple, the Ark, the Holy Mount, the place where his Feet stood*, and the like: Whereby St. *Damascene* proves the Adoration of Creatures, named *Dulia*; to wit, of the *Cross*, and of *Sacred Images*. If, I say, these Fathers make so little force of the Prepositions, as to Infer from these Texts, not only Adoration *towards the Thing*, but Adoration *of the thing*; how come these, our New Translators, thus to strain and rack the little Particle [ *ἐν* ] as to make it signifie *Leaning upon*, and utterly to exclude it from signifying any thing tending towards Adoration?

I would gladly know of them, Whether in these places of the *Psalms* there be any force in the *Hebrew Prepositions*? surely, no more, than if we should say in *English*, without Prepositions, *Adore ye his Holy Hill*: *We will Adore the place where his Feet stood*: *Adore ye his Foot-stool*; for they know, there is the same Preposition also, when it is said, *Adore ye our Lord*; or, as themselves translate it, *Worship the Lord*; where there can be no force nor signification of the Preposition: And therefore, in these places, their Translation is corrupt and wilful; when they say, *We will fall down before, or, at his Foot-stool, &c.* Where they shun and avoid, *First*, The term of *Adoration*, which the *Hebrew* and *Greek* duly express, by terms correspondent in both Languages, throughout the Bible, and are applied, for the most part, to signifie Adoring of Creatures. *Secondly*, They avoid the *Greek Phrase*, which is, at the least, to Adore *towards* these Holy things and places: And much more the *Hebrew Phrase*, which is, to Adore the very things Rehearsed. *To Adore God's Foot-stool*, (as the *Psalmist* saith) *because it is Holy*, or, *because He is Holy*, whose Foot-stool it is, as the *Greek* readeth. And St. *Augustin*, so precisely and Religiously reads, *Adore ye his Foot-stool*, that he examines the Case; and finds, thereby, that the *Blessed Sacrament* must be Adored, and that no Good Christian Takes it, before he Adores it.

Concil. Tri-  
dens. Sess.  
25.

2 Concil.  
Nice. AB. 7.

\* *St. Chrys.*  
*Oct. in*  
*Collection.*  
*S. Damasc.*  
*lib. 1. pro*  
*Imaginib.*  
*Leona. a-*  
*pud Damas.*

## Heretical Translations

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Colossians cap. 3. ver. 5.	(a) —— <i>Et Avaritiam quae est Simulacrorum Servitus.</i> [ἀβολατρεία.]	—— And Avarice, which is the Service of <i>Idols</i> .	(a) —— And Co- vetousness, which is the Worshipping of Images.	—— And Cov- etousness, which is I- dolatry.
Ephesians, cap. 5. ver. 5.	—— <i>Aut Avarus,</i> <i>quod est Idolorum</i> <i>servitus.</i>	—— Or Covetous Person, which is the Service of <i>Idols</i> .	—— <i>Or Covetous</i> <i>Man, which</i> <i>is a Worshippers</i> <i>of Images.</i>	Corrected.
2 Corinth. cap. 6. ver. 16.	(b) <i>Quis autem</i> <i>consensus Templo Dei</i> <i>cum Idolis?</i> [εἰδὼλον.]	And what agree- ment hath the Tem- ple of God with <i>Idols</i> ?	(b) <i>How agreeeth</i> <i>the Temple of</i> <i>God with Images?</i>	Corrected.
1 Ep. John, cap. 5. ver. 21.	<i>Filioli custodite</i> <i>vos à Simulacris.</i> [εἰδὼλον.]	My little Children, keep your selves from <i>Idols</i> .	Babes, keep your selves from Images.	Corrected.
1 Corinth. cap. 10. ver. 7.	<i>Neque Idololatræ</i> [εἰδωλολατρα] <i>effici-</i> <i>mini sicut quidam ex</i> <i>ipsis.</i>	Neither become ye <i>Idolaters</i> , as cer- tain of them.	Be not Wor- shippers of Images, as some of them.	Corrected also in this.

(4) Before I proceed in this, let me ask our English Translators, What is the most proper, and best English of *ιειδος*, *ιειδολατρης*, *ιειδολατρια*; *Idol*, *Idolater*, *Idolatry*? Are not these plain English words, and well known in our Language? Why then need they put three Words for one, [Worshipper of Images,] and [Worshipping of Images?] Whether is the more natural and convenient Speech, either in our English Tongue, or for the Truth of the thing, to say, as the Holy Scripture does, *Covetousness is Idolatry*; and consequently, *The Covetous Man is an Idolater*: or to say, as their first Absurd Translations have it, *Covetousness is Worshipping of Images*, and the *Covetous Man is a Worshipper of Images*? I suppose, they will scarce deny, but that there are many *Covetous Protestants*, and, perhaps, of their Clergy too, that may be put in the List with those, of whom the Apostle speaks, when he says, there are some *whose Belly is their God*: And tho' these make an *Idol* of their Money and their Bellies, by *Covetousness and Gluttony*; yet they would doubtless take it ill from us, if in their own Scripture-Language, we shoud call them *Worshippers of Images*. Who sees not, therefore, what great difference there is between *Idol* and *Image*, *Idolatry* and *Worshipping of Images*? Even so much is there between St. Pauls Words, and the Protestant Translation; but because in their latter Translations they have Corrected this shameful Absurdity, I will say no more of it.

(5) In this other, not only their Malice, but their full intent and set-purpose of deluding the poor simple People appears; This Translation being made, when *Images* were plucking down throughout England, to create in the People a Belief, That the Apostle spake against Sacred *Images* in Churches; whereas his words are against the *Idols*, and *Idolatry* of the *Gentiles*; as is plain from what goes before, exhorting them not to joyn with Infidels: for, says he, *How agreeeth the Temple of God with Idols?* [not, with *Images*] for *Images* might be had without Sin, as we see the Jews had the Images of the *Cherubims*, and the Figures of *Oxen* in the *Temple*, and the Image of the *Brazen Serpent* in the *Wilderness*, by *GOD's* Appointment; tho', as soon as they began to make an *Idol* of the *Serpent*, and Adore it as their *God*, it could no longer be kept without *Sin*. By this corrupt custom of translating *Image*, instead of *Idol*, they so bewitched their deceived Followers, as to make them despise, contemn, and abandon, even the very Sign and Image of Salvation, the Cross of *CHRIST*, and the Crucifix; whereby the manner of his bitter Death and Passion is represented; notwithstanding their signing and marking their Children with it in their Baptism, when they are first made Christians.

By such wilful Corruptions, in these and other Texts; as, *Be not Worshippers of Images, as some of them*; and, *Babes, keep your selves from Images*, which, the more to Impress in the Minds of the Vulgar, they writ upon their Church Walls; The People were animated to break down, and cast out of their Churches, the Image of our Blessed *Saviour*, His Blessed *Mother*, and the Twelve *Apostles*, &c. with so full and general a resolution of defacing, and extirpating all Tokens or Marks of our *Saviour's* Passion, that they broke down the very Crosses from the tops of Church-Steeple, where they could easily come to them. And tho', in their latter Translations, they have corrected this Corruption; yet do some of the People so freshly, to this day, retain the Malice impress'd by it upon their Parents, that they have presum'd to break the Cross, lately set on the Pinacle of the Porch of *Westminster-Abbey*: And the more to shew their spight towards that Sacred Sign of our Redemption, the Holy Cross, plac'd it, not long since, upon the Foreheads of *Bulls* and *Mastiff Dogs*; and so drove them in the Streets of *London*, to the Eternal shame of such as receive it in their Baptism, and pretend to Christianity. What could *Jews* or *Infidels* have done more? Was it not enough to break it down from the tops of Churches, and to put up the Image of a *Dragon* (the Figure wherein the Devil himself is usually represented) as upon *Bow-Church*\*; in the mid'l't of the City, but they must place it so contemptuously in the Foreheads of Beasts and Dogs?

In how great esteem the Holy Cross was had by Primitive Christians, the Fathers of those days have sufficiently testify'd in their Writings: *This Cross*, says St. *Chrysostome*, *We may see solemnly us'd in Houses, in the Market, in the Desert, in the Ways, on Mountains and Hills, in Valleys, &c.* Contrary to which, the Pretended Reformers of our Times, have not only cast it out of their *Houses*, but out of their *Churches* also: They have broken it down from all *Market-places*, from *Hills, Mountains, Valleys, and High-ways*: So that in all the Roads in *England*, there is not One *Cross* left standing entire, that I have ever heard of, except one called † *Ralph Cross* (which I have often seen) upon a Wild-Heath or Mountain, near *Danby Forreft*, in the *North Riding of York shire*.

\* *Why  
mights not a  
Cuck, (the  
Animal by  
which our  
Saviour  
was pleased  
to admisn/s  
St. Peter of  
his Sin )  
have been  
plac'd upon  
Covent-  
Garden  
Church, ra-  
ther than a  
Serpent or  
a Cross on  
Bow Church  
rather than  
a Dragon?*

† *The In-  
habitants of  
Danby,  
Roxdale,  
Westerdale,  
and Farn-  
dale may  
glory before  
all parts in  
England,  
that they  
bare a Cross  
standing to  
this day en-  
tire, in the  
mid'l't of  
them.*

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
1 Corinth. cap. 5. ver. 9, 10.	(a) <i>Scripti vobis in Epistola ne commis- cetis fornicariis, non utique fornicariis hu- jus Mundi, aut Av- aris, aut rapacibus, aut Idolis Servientibus, [εἰδωλολάτραις] alio- quin debueratis de hoc Mundo exisse: Nunc autem scripti vobis non commisceris; si is qui Frater nominatur, est fornicator aut a- varus, aut Idolis Ser- viens, &amp;c. εἰδωλολάτραις.</i>	<p>I wrote to you in an Epistle, not to keep Company with Fornicators; I mean, not the Fornicators of this World, or the Covetous, or the Extortioners, or Servers of Idols; otherwise you should have gone out of this World.</p> <p>But now I have writ to you, not to keep Company; if he that is named a Brother be a Fornicator or Covetous Person, or a Server of Idols, &amp;c.</p>	<p>(a) I wrote to you, that you should not Company with Fornicators: And I meant not all of the Fornicators of this World, either of the Covetous or Extortioners, either the Idolaters, &amp;c.</p> <p>But that ye Company not together; if any that is called a Brother, be a Fornicator, or Covetous, or a Worshipper of Images, &amp;c.</p>	It is Corrected in this Bible.
Romans, cap. 11. ver. 4.	(b) <i>Reliqui mihi septem millia virorum qui non curvaverunt Genua ante Baal.</i>	<p>I have left me Seven Thousand Men that have not bowed their Knees to Baal.</p>	<p>I have left me Seven Thousand Men that have not bowed their knees to the Image of Baal.</p>	I have left me seven Thousand Men that have not bowed their Knees to the Image of Baal.
Acts Apost. cap. 19. ver. 35.	<i>Viri Ephesi quis enim est Hominum qui nesciat Ephe- sorum civitatem cul- tricem esse Magnæ Dianæ &amp; Jovis pro- plicis? &amp; dicones;</i>	<p>Ye Men of Ephesus, for what Man is there that knoweth not the City of the Ephesians, to be a Worshipper of Great Diana, and Jupiter's Child?</p>	<p>Instead of Jupiters Child, they translate, The Image which came down from Jupiter.</p>	And here they translate, The Image which fell down from Jupiter.
Exodus, cap. 20. ver. 4.	<i>Non facies tibi Sculptile יהָנָס אֱלֹהִים.</i>	<p>Thou shalt not make to thy self any Graven thing.</p>	<p>Thou shalt not make to thy self any Graven Image.</p>	Thou shalt not make to thee any Graven Image. How

(a) **H**ow Malitious and Heretical was their Intention, who, in this one Sentence, made St. Paul seem to speak two distinct things, calling the *Pagans*, [*Idolaters*]; and such Wicked Christians as should commit the same Impiety, [*Worshippers of Images*]; whereas the Apostle uses but one and the self-same Greek Word, in speaking both of *Pagans* and *Christians*? It is a wilful and most notorious Corruption; for in the first place, speaking of *Pagans*, the Translator, according to the Text, names *Idolater*; but in the latter part of the Verse, speaking of *Christians*, they translate the very self-same Greek Word, *Worshipper of Images*. And what reason had they for this, but to make the Simple and Ignorant Reader think, that St. Paul speaks here not only of *Pagan Idolaters*, but also of *Catholick Christians*, that Reverently kneel in Prayer before the Holy Cross, or Images of our Saviour *CHRIST*, and his Saints; as tho' the Apostle had commanded such to be avoided? All the other Words, *Covetous*, *Fornicators*, *Extortioners*, they translated alike, in both places, both of *Pagans* and *Christians*: Only this Word [*Idolaters*] not so, but *Pagans*, *Idolaters*; and *Christians*, *Worshippers of Images*. Was not this done on purpose, to make both seem all One; and to signify that *Christians*, doing Reverence before Sacred Images (which *Protestants* call *Worshipping of Images*) are more to be avoided than the *Pagan Idolaters*? Whereas the Apostle, speaking of *Pagans* and *Christians* that committed one and the self-same Heinous Sin whatsoever, commands the *Christian* in that case to be avoided for his amendment, leaving the *Pagan* to himself, and to *GOD*, as having not to do to judge him.

(b) Besides their falsly translating *Image* instead of *Idol*, they have also another way of falsifying and corrupting the Scripture, by thrusting the word *Image* into the Text, when in the *Hebrew* or *Greek* there is no such thing; as in these notorious Examples, *To the Image of Baal: The Image that came down from Jupiter*: where they are not content to understand *Image* rather than *Idol*, but they must intrude it into the Text, tho' they know full well it is not in the *Greek*.

Not unlike to this kind of Falsification, is that which is crept as a Leprosie through all their Bibles, and which, it seems, they are revolv'd never to Correct; viz. Their translating *Sculptile* and *Conflatile*, *Graven Image*, and *Molten Image*; namely, in the First Commandment; where they cannot be Ignorant, that in the *Greek* it is *Idol*, and in the *Hebrew*, such a Word as signifies only a *Graven thing*, not including this word *Image*. They know that *GOD* commanded to make the *Images of Cherubins*, and of *Oxen*, in the *Temple*, and of the *Brazen Serpent* in the *Desart*; and therefore their *Wisdoms* might have considered, that he forbade not all *Graven Images*, but such as the *Gentiles Made*, and Worshipped for Gods; and therefore, *Non facies tibi Sculptile*, concurs with those words that go before, *Thou shalt have none other Gods but me*. For so to have an *Image* as to make it a God, is to make it more than an *Image*: and therefore, when it is an *Idol*, as were the *Idols* of the *Gentiles*, then it is forbid by this Commandment. Otherwile, when the *Cross* stood many *Years* upon the *Table*, in Queen *Elizabeth's Chappel*, pray was it against this Commandment? Or was it Idolatry in Her Majesty, and Her Councillors, that appointed it there? Or do their Brethren the *Lutherans* beyond Seas, at this day, commit Idolatry against this Commandment, who have in their Churches the *Crucifix*, and the *Holy Images* of the Mother of *God*, and of *St. John the Evangelist*? Or if the whole Story of the *Gospel*, concerning our Saviour *Christ*, were drawn in Pictures and Images in their Churches, as it is in many of Ours, would they say, it were a breach of this Commandment? *Fie for shame! fie for shame!* that they should with such Intollerable Impudence and Deceit, abuse and bewitch the Ignorant People, against their own Knowledge and Consciences.

For do they not know, that *God* many times forbade the *Jews*, both *Marriages*, and other *Conversation* with the *Gentiles*, lest they might fall to Worship their *Idols* as *Solomon* did, and as the *Psalm* reports of them? This then is the meaning of the Commandment, neither to make the *Idols* of the *Gentiles*, nor any other like unto them; and to that end, as did *Ferobosm in Dan and Bekeb*. By this Commandment we are forbidden, (not to make *Images*, but) to make *Idols*, or to Worship *Images*, or any thing else as *God*. *I do not*, says *St. Jo. Damascene*, *Worship an Image as God; but by the Images and Saints, I give Adoration and Honour to God, for whose sake I respect and reverence those that are his Friends*. *All over the World*, says *Pope Adrian I.*, *wherever Christianity is Profess'd, Sacred Images are Honour'd by all the Faithful, Sc. By the Image of the Body, which the Son of God took for our Redemption, we Adore our Redemer who is in Heaven; For, far be it from us, that we (as some Calumniate) should make Gods of Images: We only express the Love and Zeal we have for God, and his Saints: And as we keep the Books of the Holy Scripture, so do we the Images, to mind us of our Duty, still preserving entire the Purity of our Faith*. Learn from *St. Jerome*, after what manner they made use of *Holy Images* in his time; he writes in the Epitaph of *Paula*, *That she Adored prostrate on the Ground, before the Cross, as if she saw our Lord hanging on it*. And in *Jonas cap. 4*. he proves, That out of the Veneration and Love they had for the *Apostles*, they generally Painted their *Images* on the *Vessels*, which are call'd *Saucomaries*. And will *Protestants* say, that this was Idolatry?

2. Reg. 11.  
Psal. 105.  
St. Jo. Damascene. Cest. 3.  
Adrian I.  
Patri. Ep. ad Canitar.  
C. Iranae.  
Iupp.



(a) **F**OR these two Hebrew words [ *Pesilim* and *Massechor* ] which are in *Latin*, *Sculptilia* and *Conflatilia*, they tranlate *Images*; neither Word being *Hebrew* for an *Image*, no more than if one should ask, what is *Latin* for an *Image*? and they should tell him *Sculptile*: Whereupon he seeing a fair Painted *Image* in a Table, might perhaps say, *Ecce egregium Sculptile*; which, doubtless, every Boy in the *Grammar-School* would laugh at. And this I tell them, because I perceive their endeavour to make *Sculptile* and *Image* all one; which is most evidently false, and to their great shame appears in these Words of *Abacue*, *Quid prodest Sculptile?* &c. which, contrary to the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, they tranlate, *What profiteth the Image?* &c (as you may see in the former Page).

I wish every common Reader were able to discern their Falshood in this place: First, They make *Sculpere Sculptile* no more than *to make an Image*: which being absurd, as I have hinted, (because the Painter or Embroiderer making an *Image*, cannot be said *Sculpere Sculptile*) might teach them that the *Hebrew* has in it no signification of *Image*, no more than *Sculpere* can signify *to make an Image*: And therefore the *Greek* [ *σχετλον* ] and the *Latin* [ *Sculptile* ] precisely (for the most part) express neither more nor less than a *thing Graven*; but yet mean always by these words, a *Graven Idol*, to which signification they are appropriated by use of Holy Scripture; as are also *Simulacrum*, *Idolum*, *Conflatile*, as sometimes *Imago*: In which sense of signifying *Idols*, if they did repeat *Images* so often, altho' the Translation were not precise; yet were it in some part tolerable, because the Sense were so; but when they do it to bring all Holy Images into contempt, even the *Image* of our Saviour *Christ* Crucified, they may justly be controuled for false and Heretical Translators.— *Conflatile*, here also they falsly tranlate *Image*, as they did before in *Isaiah*, and as they have done *Sculptile*, tho' two different Words; and, as is said, each signifying another different thing from *Image*. But where they should tranlate *Image*, as *Imaginem falsam, a false Image*, they tranlate another thing, without any necessary pretence either of *Hebrew* or *Greek*, clearly avoiding here the Name of *Image*; because this place tells them, That the Holy Scripture speaketh against *False Images*; or, as themselves tranlate, such *Images* as teach *Lyes*, representing false Gods, which are not *Idolum nihil est*, (as the Apostle says) and *non sunt Dii, qui manibus sunt*. Which distinction of *False* and *True Images*, our *Protestant* Translators will not have, because they condemn all *Images*, even Holy and Sacred also; and therefore make the Holy Scriptures to speak herein, according to their own Fancies. What Monstrous and Intollerable Deceit is this?

(b) Wherein they proceed so far, That when *Daniel* said to the King, *I Worshipp not Idols made with hands*, they make him say, *I Worshipp not things that be made with hands*; leaving out the word *Idols* altogether; as tho' he had said, nothing made with hands were to be Adored; not the Ark, nor the Propitiatory, no, nor the Holy *Cross* it self, on which our Saviour shed his precious Blood. As before they added to the Text, so here they diminish and take from it as boldly, as if there had never been a Curse denounced against such Manglers of Holy Scripture.

See you not, that it is not enough for them to corrupt and falsifie the Text, and to add and take away *Words* and *Sentences* at their pleasures, but their unparallel'd presumption emboldens them to deprive the People of whole Chapters and Books, as the two last Chapters of *Daniel*, and the rest which they call *Apocrypha*, which are quite left out in their *New Bibles*. When all this is done, the poor simple People must be glad of this castrated Bible, for their *Only Rule of Faith*. *Va! Va!*

The reason they give for rejecting them is (as I told you above), *That they have formerly been doubted of*; but if you demand, why they do not, for the same reason, reject a great many more in the *New-Testament*? The whole Church of *England* answers you, in Mr. *Rogers's* Words, and by him; *How be it we judge them* [ viz. Books formerly doubted of in the *New-Testament* ] *Ca nonical, not so much because Learned and Godly Men in the Church so have, and do receive and allow of them, as for that the Holy Spirit in our Hearts do testify that they are from G O D*. Roger's *Defence of the 39 Articles*, pag. 31, 32. So that *Protestants* are purely beholden to the *Private Spirit* in the *Hearts* of their *Convocation-Men*, for almost half of the *New-Testament*; which had never been admitted by them in the *Canon of Scripture*, if the said *Private Spirit in their Hearts had not testify'd their being from G O D*; no more than the rest call'd *Apocrypha*, which they not only thrust out of the *Canon*, but omit to publish in their smaller Impressions of the *Bible*; because, forsooth, the *Holy* [ *private* ] *Spirit in their Hearts*, testifies them to speak too expressly against their *Heretical Doctrines*.

<i>The Book, Chapter, and Verse.</i>	<i>The Vulgar Latin Text.</i>	<i>The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.</i>	<i>Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.</i>	<i>The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.</i>
Acts Apost. cap. 2. ver. 27.	(a) <i>Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in Inferno.</i>  <i>שְׁנָאָל בְּקָרְבָּן הַשְׁמָרָה</i>	Because thou wilt not leave my <i>Soul in Hell.</i>	(a) <i>Thou shalt not leave my Car- cass in the Grave.</i> —Beza. <i>Thou wilt not leave my Soul in the Grave. (Bib. 1579.)</i>	It is Corrected in this Translation.
Genesis, cap. 37. ver. 35.	(b) <i>Descendam ad filium meum lugens in infernum [ 'אָשָׁ ׁאָשָׁא, <i>Infernus</i>; for so are the Hebr. Greek, and Latin words for Hell.]</i>	I will go down to my Son into <i>Hell</i> mourning.	(b) <i>I will go down into the Grave unto my Son mourning.</i>	(b) I will go down into the <i>Grave.</i>
Genesis, cap. 42. ver. 38.	<i>Deducetis Canos meos cum dolore ad Inferos.</i>	You will bring down my Gray Hairs with Sorrow unto <i>Hell.</i>	<i>Instead of Hell, they say Grave.</i>	For <i>Hell</i> , they al- so say, <i>Grave.</i>
Genesis, cap. 44. ver. 29, 31.	<i>Deducetis Canos meos cum mærore ad Inferos.</i>	— With Sorrow unto <i>Hell.</i>	<i>With sorrow unto the Grave.</i>	With sorrow un- to the <i>Grave.</i>
III Reg. cap. 2. ver. 6, 9.	— <i>Ad Inferos.</i>	— Unto <i>Hell.</i>	— <i>To the Grave.</i>	— <i>To the Grave.</i>

THE Doctrine of our Pretended Reformers, is, *That there was never, from the beginning of the World, any other place for Souls, after this Life, but only Two, to wit, Heaven for the Blessed, and Hell for the Damned.* This Heretical Doctrine includes many Erroneous Branches: *First*, That all the Holy Patriarchs, Prophets, and other Holy Men, of the *Old Testament*, went not into a *Third Place*, called, *Abraham's Bosom, or Limbus Patrum*; but immediately to *Heaven*: That they were in *Heaven* before our Blessed Saviour had suffer'd Death for their Redemption, whence it will follow, That our Saviour was not the first Man that Ascended, and entred into *Heaven*. Moreover, by this Doctrine it will follow, That our Saviour *Christ* descended not into any *Third Place* (in our Creed call'd *Hell*) to deliver the Fathers of the *Old Testament*, and to bring them Triumphant with him into *Heaven*: And so, that Article of the Apostles Creed, concerning our Saviour's *Descent into Hell*, must either be put out, (as indeed it was by *Beza* in the Confession of his Faith, Printed *Anno. 1564.*) or it must have some other meaning; to wit, Either the lying of his Body in the *Grave*; or, (as *Calvin*, and his Followers will have it) The Suffering of *Hell-Torments*, and Pains upon the *Cross*.

Calvin's  
Instit. lib.  
2. c. 16.  
SeB. 10.  
& in his  
Catechism.

Psal. 15.  
cap. 2.

See Beza's  
Anstat. in  
Act. 2.

St. Chrys.  
in Eoh. 4.  
St. Irenaeus  
Lub. 5. fine.

(a) In defence of these Erroneous Doctrines, they most wilfully corrupt the Holy Scriptures; and especially *Beza*, who in his *New Testament*, Printed by *Robers Stephanus*, *Anno. 1556.* makes our Blessed Saviour *Christ* say thus to his Father, *Non Derelinques Cadaver meum in Sepulchro*; for that which the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin*, and *St. Hierom*, according to the *Hebrew* say, *Non derelinques, animam meam in Inferno*. Thus the Prophet *David* spake it in *Hebrew*: Thus the *Septuaginta* uttered it in *Greek*: Thus the Apostle *St. Peter* alledges it: Thus *St. Luke* in the *Acts of the Apostles*: And for this, *St. Augustin* calls him an *Infidel* that denies it. Yet all this would not suffice to make *Beza* translate it so; because, as he says, He would avoid (certain Errors, as he calls them) the Catholick Doctrine of *Limbus Patrum* and *Purgatory*. And therefore, because else it would make for the *Papists* Doctrine, he translates *Animam, Carcasis, Infernum, Grave*.

And tho' our *English* Translators are ashame'd of this foul and absurd Corruption; yet their Intention appears to come not much, if any thing at all, short of *Beza's*; for, in their Bible of 1579. they have it in the Text, *Thou wilt not leave my Soul in the Grave*; and in the Margent, they put, or *Life*, or *Person*; thereby advertising the Reader, that if it please him, he may read thus, *Thou shalt not leave my Life in the Grave*, or, *Thou shalt not leave my Person in the Grave*: As tho' either *Man's Soul* or *Life* were in the *Grave*, or *Animam* might be translated *Person*. I said, They were ashame'd of *Beza's* Translation; but one would rather think, they purposely design'd to make it worse, if possible. But you see the last Translators have indeed been ashame'd of it, and have Corrected it. See you not now, what monstrous and absurd work our first Pretended Reformers made with the Holy Scriptures, on purpose to make it speak for their own turns? By their putting *Grave* in the Text, they design to make it a certain and absolute Conclusion, (howsoever you Interpret *Soul*) that the Holy Scripture, in this place, speaks not of *Christ's* being in *Hell*, but only in the *Grave*; and that according to his *Soul, Life, or Person*, (or, as *Beza* says, his *Carkas*.) And so his *Soul in Hell*, as the Scripture speaks, must be his *Carkas, Soul, or Life in the Grave*, with them. But *St. Chrysostome* says, *He descended to Hell, that the Souls which were there bound, might be loosed.* And as plain are the words of *St. Irenaeus*; *During the three days He conversed with the Dead* were: *As the Prophecy says of him, He remembered his Holy Ones, who were Dead, those who before slept in the Land of Promise; He descended to them, to fetch them out, and save them.*

(b) How absurd also is this Corruption of theirs, *I will go down into the Grave, unto my Son?* as tho' *Jacob* thought that his Son *Joseph* had been Buried in a *Grave*; whereas, a little before, he said, that some *Wild Beast* had *Devoured* him: But if they mean the state of all Dead Men, by *Grave*, why do they call it *Grave*, and not *Hell*, as the Word is in *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin*? But I must demand of our latter Translators, Why they did not Correct this, as they have done the former, seeing the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin* words are the same in both? It cannot be through Ignorance, I find: No! it must have been purely out of a Design, to make their Ignorant Reader believe, that the Patriarch *Jacob* spake of his *Body* only to descend into the *Grave* to *Joseph's* *Body*: For as concerning *Jacob's* *Soul*, that (by their Opinion) was to ascend immediately after his Death into *Heaven*, and not to descend into the *Grave*. But if *Jacob* were forthwith to ascend in *Soul*, how could he say, as they translate, *I will go down into the Grave, unto my Son, Muring?* As if, according to their Opinion, he shou'd say, *My Son's Body is devoured of a Beast, and his Soul is gone up into Heaven:* Well, *I will go down to him into the Grave.*

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Psalm 85. ver. 13.	(a) <i>Et eruisti ani- mam meam ex Infer- no inferiori.</i>	Thou hast deli- vered my Soul from the <i>lower Hell</i> .	(a) <b>Thou hast de- livered my Soul from the lowest Grave.</b>	Instead of <i>lower</i> Hell, they say, <i>lowest</i> Hell.
Psalm 89. ver. 49.	(b) <i>Eruit animam suam de manu Inferi.</i>	Shall he deliver his Soul from the hand of <i>Hell</i> ?	(b) <b>Shall he deli- ver his Soul from the hand of the Grave?</b>	Shall he deliver his Soul from the hand of the <i>Grave</i> ?
Hosea, cap. 13. ver. 14.	<i>Ero mors tua, O mors, morsus tuus ero Inferne, 789</i>	O Death, I will be thy Death; I will be thy sting, O Hell.	— O Grave, I will be thy De- struction.	O Death, I will be thy <i>Plagues</i> ; O Grave, I will be thy <i>Destru- ction</i> .
1 Corinth. cap. 15. ver. 55.	<i>Ubi est mors si- mulus tuus? ubi est Inferne Victoria tua? [ad h.]</i>	Where is, O Death, thy Sting, where is, O Hell, thy Victory?	O Death, where is thy Sting? O Grave, where is thy Victory?	For Hell, they say Grave.
Psalm 6. ver. 5.	<i>In Inferno autem quis confitebitur tibi?</i>	But in Hell, who shall confess to thee?	They say, In the Grave.	In the Grave, who shall give thee Thanks?
Proverbs, cap. 27. ver. 20.	<i>Infernus &amp; Perdi- tio nunquam imple- tur.</i>	Hell and Destru- ction are never full.	The Grave and Destruction are never full.	Corrected.
Hebrews, cap. 5. ver. 7.	(c) <i>Qui in diebus Carnis sua preces sup- plicationesque ad eum qui pro fit illum salvum facere a morte cum clamore valido &amp; Lachrymis offerens exauditus est pro sua Reverentia, [et in eius evanescere.]</i>	Who in the days of his Flesh, with a strong Cry and Tears, offering Pray- ers and Supplications to him that could save him from Death, was heard for his Reverence.	(c) <b>Which in days of his Flesh, offer- ed up Prayers, with strong Cry- ing, unto him that was able to save him from Death, and was heard, In that which he feared.</b>	Who in the days, etc. And was heard in that he feared.

(a) **U**nderstand, Good Reader, that in the *Old Testament*, none Ascended into *Heaven*, *This way* of the *Holies* (as the Apostle says) being not yet made open; because our Saviour *Christ* himself was to *Dedicate that New and Living way*, and begin the Entrance in his own Person, and by his Passion to open *Heaven*; for none but He was found worthy to open the *Seals*, and to read the *Book*. Therefore (as I said before) the common Phrase of the *Holy Scripture*, in the *Old Testament*, is even of the best of Men, as well as others, that dying, they *went down ad Inferos*, or, *ad Infernum*; that is, descended not to the *Grave*, which received their Bodies only; but, *ad Inferos*, into *Hell*, a common Receptacle for their Souls.

Heb. 9. ver.  
8.  
Heb. 10.  
ver. 20.

So we say in our *Creed*, That our Saviour *CHRIST* himself descended into *Hell*, according to his Soul. So St. *Hierom*, speaking of the State of the *Old Testament*, says, *If Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were in Hell, who was in the Kingdom of Heaven?* And again, *Before the Coming of CHRIST, Abraham was in Hell; after his Coming, the Thief was in Paradise*. And lest it might be objected, that *Lazarus* being in *Abraham's Bosom*, saw the Rich Glutton a far off in *Hell*; and that therefore, both *Abraham* and *Lazarus* seem to have been in *Heaven*: the same *Holy Doctor* resolves it, That *Abraham* and *Lazarus* also were in *Hell*, but in a place of great Rest and Refreshing; and therefore very far off from the miserable wretched Glutton, that lay in *Torments*. Which is also agreeable to St. *Augustin*'s Interpretation of this place, in the *Psalm*, *Thou hast delivered my Soul from the Lower Hell*; who makes this Sense of it, That the *Lower Hell* is it, where in the Damned are Tormented, The *Higher Hell* is that, wherein the Souls of the Just rested, calling both Places by the Name of *Hell*. To avoid this distinction of the *Inferior* and *Higher Hell*, our first Translators, instead of *Lower Hell*, rendred it *Lowest Grave*; which they would not for shame have done, had they not been afraid to say in any place of Scripture (how plain soever) that any Soul was deliver'd or return'd from *Hell*; lest it might there follow, that the Patriarchs, and our Saviour *CHRIST* were in such an *Hell*: And tho' the last Translation has restor'd the word *Hell*, in this place; yet so loath were our Translators to hear the Scripture speak of *Limbus Patrum* or *Purgatory*, that they still retain'd the Superlative *Lowest*, lest the Comparative *Lower* (which is the true Translation) might seem more clearly to evince this Distinction between the *Superior* and *Inferior Hell*; tho' they could not at the same time be Ignorant of this Sentence of *Tertullian*; *I know that the Bosom of Abraham was no Heavenly place, but only the Higher Hell; or the higher part of Hell*. Nor can I believe, but that they mult have read these Words in St. *Chrysostome*, upon that place of *Esai*. *I will break the Brazen Gates, and bruise the Iron Bars in peeces, and will open the Treasury darkned, &c. So he (the Prophet) calls Hell*, says he, *For alibough it were Hell, yet it held the Holy Souls, and precious Vessells*, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Epitaph.  
Nepos.  
cap. 3.

St. Aug. in  
Psal. 85.  
ver. 13.

Tertul. lib.  
4. aduersus  
Marcion.  
S. Chrysost.  
Hom. quid  
Christus fit  
Dewi, To. 5.

(b) And thus all along, where-ever they find the word *Hell*, that is, where it signifies the place in which the Holy Fathers of the *Old Testament* rested, called by the Church [*Limbus Patrum*] they are sure to translate it *Grave*; a Word as much contrary to the signification of the *Greek*, *Hebrew*, or *Latin* words, as *Bread* is to the *Latin* word *Lac*. If I ask them, what is *Hebrew*, *Greek*, or *Latin* for *Hell*, must they not tell me *ΝΝΩν adūs, Infernus*? If I ask them what words they will bring from those Languages to signify *Grave*, must they not say, *ζετερον τάφος, Sepulchrum*? With what Face then can they look upon these willful Corruptions of theirs?

(c) Note here another most damnable Corruption of theirs; Instead o' translating (as all Antiquity, with a general and full consent, has ever done in this place) *That CHRIST was heard of his Father, for his Reverence*; they read, *That he was heard in that which he feared*; or, as this last Bible has it, *And was heard in that he feared*. And who taught them this Sense of the Text? doubtless *Beza*; who, for the most part they follow; and he had it from *Calvin*, who, he says, was the first that ever found out this Interpretation. — And why Invented *Calvin* this, but to defend his Blasphemous Doctrine, *That our Saviour Jesus CHRIST upon the Cross, was horribly afraid of Damnation: And that he was in the very Sorrows and Torments of the Damned: And that this was his descending into Hell: And that otherwise he descended not*. Note this, good Reader, and then judge to what wicked end this Translation tends. Who-ever heard of greater Blafphemy; and yet they dare presume to force the Scripture, by their false Translation, to back them in it; *He was heard in that which he feared*: as if they should say, He was delivered from Damnation, and the Eternal pains of Hell, of which he was fore afraid. What dare they not do, who tremble not at this?

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The Last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Romans, cap. 2. ver. 26.	(a) <i>Si igitur præputiū Justitias [�γειαματα]  legis custodiat, &amp;c.</i>	If then the Pre- puce keep the <i>Justices</i> of the Law, &c.	(a) <b>If the Uncircum- cision keep the Or- dinances of the Law.</b>	If therefore the <i>Uncircumcision</i> keep the <i>Righteousness</i> of the Law.
St. Luke, cap. 1. ver. 6.	<i>Erant autem Justi [δικαιοι] ambo ante Deum incedentes in omnibus mandatis &amp; Justificationibus [τα δικαιωματα] Domini sine querela.</i>	And they were both <i>Just</i> before God, walking in all the Commandments and <i>Justifications</i> of our Lord, without blame.	And they were both <i>Righteous</i> be- fore God, walking in all the <i>Com- mandments and Ordinances</i> of the Lord, <i>blameless</i> .	And they were both <i>Righteous</i> be- fore God, walking in all the <i>Command- ments and Ordin- ances</i> of the Lord, <i>blameless</i> .
Apocalips, cap. 19. ver. 8.	(b) <i>Byssinum enim, Ju- stifications sunt San- ctorum. [τα δικαιωματα.]</i>	For the <i>Silk</i> are the <i>Justifications</i> of Saints.	(b) <b>For the fine Lin- nen are the Righte- ousness of Saints.</b>	For the <i>fine Lin- nen</i> is the <i>Righteous- ness</i> of Saints.
2 Timoth. cap. 4. ver. 8.	(c) <i>In reliquo, reposita est mihi Corona Ju- stitiae, [της δικαιούντος,]  quam reddet mihi Do- minus in illa die Justus Index [ο δικαιοντος]  et iustus, &amp;c.]</i>	Concerning the rest, there is laid up for me a Crown of <i>Justice</i> , which our Lord will render to me in that day a <i>Just</i> Judge.	(c) <b>Henceforth there is laid up for me a Crown of righteousness, which the Lord the Righ- teous Judge shall give me, &amp;c.</b>	For <i>Justice</i> , they translate <i>Righteous- ness</i> : And for a <i>Just Judge</i> , they say a <i>Righteous Judge</i> .
II Thessalo. cap. 1. ver. 5, 6.	<i>— In Exemplum Justi [δικαιου] Judicii Dei, ut digni habe- mini in regno Dei, pro quo &amp; patiamini si tamen Justum est, [δικαιος ist.] apud De- um retribuere tribula- tionem iis qui vos tri- bulant.</i>	For an Example of the <i>Just</i> Judgment of God, that you may be counted worthy of the Kingdom of God for which you suffer, that yet it be <i>Just</i> with God to re- pay Tribulation to them that vex you, and to you that are vexed, rest with us, &c.	<b>Rejoyce, &amp;c. — Which is a token of the Righteous Judgment of God, that you may be counted worthy of the Kingdome of God, for which ye suffer. For it is a Righteous thing with God, to re- compence Tribu- lation to them that trouble you, and to you that are troubled rest.</b>	Here also they say <i>Righteous Judgment</i> , and <i>Righteous thing</i> , instead of <i>Just</i> , &c.
Hebrews, cap. 6. ver. 10.	<i>Non enim Injustus [αδικος] Deus, ut obli- viscatur operis vestri, &amp;c.</i>	For God is not <i>Unjust</i> , that he should forget your Works, &c.	<b>God is not Un- righteous, to forget your good works and labour.</b>	For God is not <i>Unrighteous</i> , &c.

(a) **A**s the Article of *Justification* has many branches, and as their Errors therein are manifold; so are their *English* Translations accordingly many ways False and Heretical: *First*, Against *Justification* by *Good-Works*, and by keeping the Commandments, they suppress the very Name of *Justification* in all such places where the word signifies the Commandments, or the *Law* of *GOD*; and where the *Greek* signifies most exactly *Justices* and *Justifications*, according as our Vulgar *Latin* translates, *Justicias & Justificationes*, there the *English* Translations say, *Statutes or Ordinances*; as you see in these Examples, where their last Translation (because they would seem to be doing, tho' to final purpose) changes the first Corruption [*Ordinances of the Law*] into *Righteousness*; another word, as far from what it should have been (in comparison) as the first: And to what end is all this, but to avoid the term *Justifications*? they cannot be Ignorant how different this is from the *Greek*, which they pretend to translate. — In the *Old-Testament*, perhaps they will pretend that they follow the *Hebrew* word, which is [*דְּבָרִים*]; and therefore they translate *Statutes* and *Ordinances* [*Righteousness* too, if they please]; but even there also, are not the *Seventy Greek Interpreters* sufficient to teach them the signification of the *Hebrew* word, who always Interpret it, *דְּבָרָה*; in *English*, *Justifications*?

But admit that they may controul the *Septuagint* in the *Hebrew*; yet in the *New-Testament* they do not pretend to translate the *Hebrew*, but rather the *Greek*; What reason have they then for rejecting the word *Just* and *Justifications*? surely, no other reason, but that which their Master *Beza* gives for the same thing; saying, That he rejected the word *Justifications*, on purpose to avoid the *Cavils* that might be made from this word, against *Justification by Faith*: As if he should say, This Word, truly translated according to the *Greek*, might minister great occasion to prove, by so many places of Scripture, that Man's *Justification* is not by *Faith* only, but also by keeping the *Law*, and observing the Commandments of *GOD*; which, therefore, are call'd according to the *Greek* and *Latin*, *Justificationes*, because they concur to *Justification*, and the making a Man *Just*: As by St. *Luke's* words, also, is well signified; which have this Allusion, that they were both *Just*, because they walk'd in all the *Justifications* of our Lord; which they designedly suppress by other words.

(b) And hereof also it rises, that when *Beza* could not possibly avoid the word in his Translation, (*Apoc. 19. 8. The Silk is the Justifications of Saints*) he helps the matter with this Commentary, That *Justifications* are those *Good Works*, which are the *Testimony* of a lively *Faith*. But our *English* Translators have found another way to avoid the word, even in their Translations: For they (because they could not say *Ordinances*) translate, *The Righteousness of Saints*; Abhorring the word *Justifications of Saints*, because they know full-well, that this word includes the *Good-works* of *Saints*; which Works, if they should in translating, call their *Justifications*, it would rise up against their *Justification by Faith only*: Therefore, where they cannot translate *Ordinances* and *Statutes*, which are terms farthest off from *Justification*, they say, *Righteousness*, making it also the Plural Number; whereas the more proper *Greek* word for *Righteousness*, is *ιερότης* (*Dan. 6. 22.*) which there some of them translate *Uniquiness*, because they will not translate exactly if you would hire them.

And by their translating *Righteous*, instead of *Just*, they bring it, that *Joseph* was a *Righteous* Man, rather than a *Just* Man; and *Zachary* and *Elizabeth* were both *Righteous* before *GOD*, rather than *Just*; because when a Man is called *Just*, it sounds, that he is so indeed, and not by *Imputation* only. Note also, That where *Faith* is joyn'd with the word *Just*, they omit not for to translate it *Just*, [*The Just shall live by Faith*] to signify that *Justification* is by *Faith* alone.

(c) These places (*2 Tim. 2 Thessal. & Heb.*) do very fairly discover their False and Corrupt Intentions, in concealing the word *Justice* in all their Bibles; for, if they should translate truly, as they ought to do, it would Infer, That Men are *justly* Crown'd in *Heaven* for their *Good Works* upon *Earth*; and that it is *GOD's* *Justice* so to do; and that He will do so, because He is a *just Judge*; and because He will shew his *just Judgment*; and He will not forget so to do, because He is not *Unjust*; as the Ancient Fathers do Interpret and Expound. St. *Augustin* most excellently declares, That it is *GOD's* *Grace*, *Favour*, and *Mercy* in making us, by his *Grace*, to Live and Believe well, and so to be worthy of *Heaven*; and his *justice* and *just Judgment*, to render and repay *Eternal Life* for those Works which Himself wrought in us: which he thus expresseth, *How should he render or repay as a just Judge, unless He had given it as a Merciful Father?*

*Beza in  
Annotation  
in 1 Luk.*

*Beza An-  
notat. in  
Apoc. 19.*

*Rom. 1.*

*St. Chrys.  
Theodoret,  
Oecumen.  
upon these  
places.  
St. Aug. de  
Gra. &  
lib. Arbit.  
cap. 6.*

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles Printed An. Dom 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Romans, cap. 8. ver. 18.	(a) Existimo [εστιμω] enim quod non sunt condignae passiones hujus tempora- ris ad futuram Glori- am, &c. [εν αξια της τωι μελλοντοι θεων.]	For I think that the Passions of this time are not <i>Condign</i> to the Glory to come, that shall be revealed in us.	(a) For I am certainly perswaded, that the afflictions of this time, are not Worthy of the Glory which shall be in us.	For I reckon, that the Sufferings of this present time, are not Worthy to be com- pared with the Glory which shall be re- vealed in us.
Hebrews, cap. 10. ver. 29.	(b) Quanto magis putatis deteriora me- ri supplicia, [πιστεις χειρος αδικωντων πνευματων] qui Filium Dei conculcaverit, &c.	How much more, think you, doth he deserve worse puni- shments, who hath trodden the Son of God under-foot?	(b) How much soever shall be be- punished, which treadeth under- foot the Son of God?	Of how much so- erer punishment, sup- pose ye, shall he be thought Worthy, who hath trodden under- foot the Son of God?
Colloſſians cap. 1. ver. 12.	(c) Gratias agen- tes Deo Patri qui Dignos, [ιερωδιων] nos fecit in partem, sortis Sanctorum in lumine.	Giving thanks to God the Father, who hath made us <i>wor- thy</i> unto the part of the <i>Lot</i> of the Saints in the Light.	(c) Giving thanks to God the Father, that hath made us <i>Meet</i> to be partakers of the Inheritance of the Saints in Light.	Giving thanks un- to the Father, that hath made us <i>Meet</i> , &c.
Psalm 118. ver. 112.	(d) Inclinavi cor meum ad faciendas Justificationes tuas in Eternum propter Re- tributionem.	I have inclined my heart to do thy <i>Justi- fications</i> for ever for Reward.	(d) I have ap- plied my heart to fulfil thy Statutes always, even unto the end.	---Even unto the end.
Hebrews, cap. 2. ver. 9.	(e) Eum autem qui modico quam An- geli minoratus est, vi- demus Iesum propter passionem mortis gloria & honore coronatum.	But him that was a little lessened under the Angels, we see Jesus, because of the Passion of Death, Crowned with Glory and Honour.	(e) We see Jesus Crowned with Glory and Honor, which was a little inferior to the An- gels, thro' the suf- fering of Death, Crowned with Glory and Honour.	But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the Angels, for the suf- fering of Death, Crowned with Glory and Honour.

(a) I shall not say much of this gross Corruption, because they have been pleas'd to Correct it in their last Translation: Nor will I stand upon their first words [*I am certainly persuaded*] which is a far greater Assveration, than the Apostle uses; I wonder how they could thus translate that Greek word, *ποιησας*; but that they were resolv'd not only to translate the Apostles words falsly, against *Meritorious Works*, but also to avouch and affirm the same lustily. And for the words following, they are not in *Greek*, as they translate in their first Eng. Bibles, [*The Afflictions are not worthy of the Glory.*] &c. (because they will not have our Suffering here, tho' for *CHRIST*'s sake, to Merit Eternal Glory;) but thus, *The afflictions of this time, are not equal, correspondent, or comparable to the Glory to come*, because they are short; but the Glory is Eternal, the Afflictions are small and few, in comparison; the Glory great and abundant, above measure. By this the Apostle would encourage us to Suffer, as he does also in another place, very plainly, when he says, *Our Tribulation, which presently is for a moment and light, Worketh [Prepareth, says their Bible, 1577. with a very false Meaning] above Measure exceedingly, an Eternal weight of Glory in us:* See you not here, that short Tribulation in this Life Works, that is, Causes, Purchases, and Deserves an Eternal weight of Glory in the next? And what is that, but to be Meritorious, and worthy of the same? as St. Cyprian says, *O what manner of day shall come, my Brethren, when our Lord shall recount the Merits of every one, and pay us the Reward, or stipend of Faith and Devotion?* Here you see are Merits, and the Reward for the same. — Likewise St. Augustin; *The exceeding goodness of God has provided this, that the Labours should soon be ended, but the Rewards of the Merits shall endure without end;* the Apostle testifying, *the Passions of this time are not comparable, &c. For we shall receive greater Bliss, than are the afflictions of all Passions whatsoever.*

St. Cyprian  
Ep. 56. n. 3  
S. Augustin.  
Serm. 57.  
de sanct.

Bible of  
1562.

(b) How deceitfully they deal with the Scripture in this place? One of their Bibles very falsly and corruptly leaving out the words, [*Worthy of, or Deserve*] saying, *How much sorrier shall he be Punished, &c?* And the last of their Translations, adding as falsly to the Text, the word [*Thought*] *How much sorrier Punishment shall he be thought worthy of, &c?* And this is done to avoid this consequence, which must have follow'd, by translating the *Greek* word sincerely; to wit, If the *Greek* here, by their own Translation, signifie to be *Worthy of*, or to *Deserve*, being spoken of Pains or Punishments deserved; then must they grant us the same word to signifie the same thing, else, where in the *New Testament*, when it is spoken of deserving *Heaven*, and the Kingdom of *GOD*, as in *Luk. cap. 20, and 21.* where, if they translate according to the *Greek*, which they pretend to, they should say, *May be Worthy*, and, *They that are Worthy*; and not according to the Vulgar *Latin*, which, I see, they are willing to follow, when they think it may make the more for their turn.

(c) The *Greek* word *ἰκανῶς*, they translate to make *Meet* in this place; but in other places (viz. *Mat. 3. c. 8. 11 & v. 8.*) they translate, *icardi*, *Worthy*. And why could they not follow the Old *Latin* Interpreter one step further? seeing this was the place where they should have shew'd their Sincerity, and have said, *That God makes us Worthy of Heavenly Bliss*; because they cannot but know, that if *ἰκανός* be *Worthy*, then *ἰκανῶς* must needs be, *to make Worthy*. But they follow their Old Master *Beza*, who tells them, *That here, and here, and so forth, I have follow'd the Old Latin Interpreter, translating it *Worthy*;* but in such and such a place (meaning this for one) I chuse rather to say *Meet*: What presumption is here? The *Greek* Fathers Interpret it *Worthy*. St. *Cyril of Rome*, upon this place, says, *God doth not only give us Society with the Saints, but makes us also Worthy to receive so great a Dignity.* And *Occumius* says, *That it is God's Glory to make his Servants Worthy of such good things: And that it is their glory to be made Worthy of such things.*

2d Anno-  
tat. in 3.  
March. No.  
Text. 1556.  
Occum. in  
Caten.  
St. Basil in  
Orat. Litur

(d) Here is yet another most notorious Corruption against *Merits*; *I have applied my Heart to fulfil thy Statutes, always, even unto the End;* and for their Evasion here, they fly to the Ambiguity of the *Hebrew* Word, [*זְבַח*] as if the Seventy Interpreters were not sufficient to determine the same; but because they find it ambiguous, they are resolv'd to take their liberty, tho' contrary to St. *Hierom*, and the Ancient Fathers, both *Greek* and *Latin*.

(e) In fine, So obstinately are they set against *Merits*, and *Meritorious Works*, that some of them think, that even *Christ* himself did not *Merit* his own Glory and Exaltation: For making out of which Error, I suppose, they have transpos'd the words of this Text, thereby making the Apostle say, *That Christ was made Inferior to Angels by his suffering Death;* that is, says *Beza*, *For to suffer Death;* by which they quite exclude the true Sense, [*That for suffering Death, he was Crowned with Glory;*] which are the true words and meaning of the Apostle. But in their last Translations, they so place the words, that they will have it left so ambiguous, that you may follow whether sense you will: Intolerable is their Deceit!

See Calvin  
in *Eng. ad*  
*Philip.*

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
St. John, cap. 1. ver. 12.	(a) <i>Quicquid au- tem receperunt eum, dedit eis potestatem eis aū. filios Dei fieri.</i>	But as many as received him, he gave them <i>Power</i> to be made the Sons of God.	(a) <i>But as ma- ny as received him, he gave them Prerogative, [Dignity saith Beza] to be the Sons of God.</i>	Corrected.
1 Corinth. cap. 15. ver. 10.	(b) <i>— Sed abun- dantiis illis omnibus laboravi: non ego au- tem sed Gratia Dei mecum. ἵνα εἰστῶ θεοῦ ἐν σώματι Χριστοῦ.</i>	---- But I have la- boured more abund- antly than all they; yet not I, but the Grace of God with me.	(b) <i>— yet not I, but the Grace of God which is with me.</i>	---- Yet not I, but the Grace of God which was with me.
Ephesians, cap. 3. ver. 12.	(c) <i>In quo habe- mus fiduciam &amp; ac- cessum in confidentia per fidem ejus.</i>	In whom we have affiance and access in confidence, by the Faith of him.	(c) <i>By whom we have boldness and entrance, with the confidence wh is by the Faith of him, (or in him, as Beza has it.)</i>	Corrected.
2 Corinth. cap. 6. ver. 1.	(d) <i>Adjuvantes [Συνεργῶντες] autem exhortamur, ne in va- cuum gratiam Dei re- cipiatis.</i>	And we helping, do Exhort, that you receive not the Grace of God in vain.	(d) <i>And we Gods Labourers, &amp;c. In another Bible, We together are Gods Labourers.</i>	Corrected.
Romans, cap. 5. ver. 6.	(e) <i>Ut quid enim Christus, cum adhuc infirmi essemus, [οὐτοῦ οὐαῦ ἀδερῶν] secundum tempus pro Impiis mortuus est.</i>	For, why did Christ, when we as yet were weak, accord- ing to the time, Die for the Impious.	(e) <i>Christ, when we were yet of no strength, died for the ungodly.</i>	For when we were yet <i>without strength</i> , in due time Christ died for the ungodly.
1 Ep. John, cap. 5. ver. 3.	(f) <i>Hæc est e- nīm Charitas Dei, ut mandata ejus custodi- amus: &amp; Mandata e- jus gravia non sunt, [αἱ ἀνταρταὶ θεοῖς εἰσίν.]</i>	For this is the Charity of God, that we keep his Com- mandments: And his Commandments are not heavy.	(f) <i>— And his Commandments are not grievous.</i>	---- Instead of, <i>His Commandments are not heavy</i> , they say, <i>Are not grievous.</i>
St. Matth. cap. 19. ver. 11.	(g) <i>Qui dixit il- lis non omnes ca- pient [εἰ μήτε χρήσαν] verbum istud, sed qui- bus datum est.</i>	---- All men do not receive this saying.	(g) <i>— All men cannot receive this saying.</i>	---- All men can- not receive this say- ing.

(a) **A**gainst Free-Will, instead of Power, They translate, *Prerogative*; and *Beza*, *Dignity*; *Power* and *Authority*, here he refused both indeed against Free-Will; which, he says, the *Sophists* would prove out of this place, reprobating *Erasmus* for following them in his Translation.—But whereas the Greek Word is indifferent to signify *Dignity* or *Liberty*; he that will translate either of these, and exclude the other, restrains the Sense of the *Holy Ghost*, and determines it to his own Fancy. Now may we as well translate *Liberty*, as *Beza* does *Dignity*? but we must not abridge the Sense of the *Holy Ghost* to one particular meaning; and therefore we translate *Potestas* and *Power*, words indifferent to signify both *Dignity* and *Liberty*: But in their last Bible it is Corrected. It had been well, if they had Corrected this next, tho' I think, of the two, they have made it worse; translating, *Not I, but the Grace of GOD which was with me* (*Which is with me*, say their Old Bibles.)

(b) By which Falsity, they here also restrain the Sense of the *Holy Ghost*; whereas, if they had translated according to Sincerity, —*Yet not I, but the Grace of God with me*, the Text might have had not only the Sense they confine it to, but also this, *Not I, but the Grace of God which laboured with me*. So that, by this latter, it may be evidently signify'd, That the Grace of God, and the Apostle, both laboured together; and not only *Grace*, as if the Apostle had done nothing, like unto a Block, or forced only; but that the *Grace of God* did so concur, as the Principal Agent, with all his Labours that his *Free-Will* wrought with it: And this is the most approved Interpretation of this place which their Translation, (by putting, *which is, or, which was* into the Text) excludes.

But they reprehend the Vulgar *Latin* Interpreter for neglecting the *Greek* Article, not considering that the same many times cannot be express'd in *Latin*; the *Greek* Phrase having this *Prerogative* above the *Latin*, to speak more briefly, commodiously, and significantly by the Article, as *Jacobus Zebedai*, *Jacobus Alphai*, *Judas Jacobi*, *Maria Cleophae*; in all which, tho' the *Greek* Article is not express'd, yet they are all sincerely translated into *Latin*. Nor can the Article be express'd without adding more than the Article, and so not without adding to the Text, as they do very boldly in such Speeches, throughout the *New-Testament*? Yea, they do it when there is no Article in the *Greek*, and that purposely: As in this of the *Ephesians* (c) where they say, *Confidence, is by Faith, as tho' there were no Confidence by Works*. The *Greek*, *εν πίστι οὐδὲ τίς τοις* bears not that Translation, unless there were an Article after *Confidence*, which is not; but they add it to the Text: As also *Beza* does the like (*Rom. 8. 2.*), and their *Geneva English* Testaments after him, for to maintain the Heresie of *Imputative Justice*: As in his Annotations he plainly deduces, saying confidently, *I doubt not, but a Greek Article must be understood*; and therefore, forsooth, put into the Text also. He does the same in *St. James 2. ver. 20.* still debating the case in his Annotations, why he does so; and when he has concluded in his Fancy, that this or that is the Sense, he puts it so in the Text, and translates accordingly. But if they say, That in this place (c) of the *Corinthians*, there is a *Greek Article*, and therefore they do well to express it. I Answer, *First*, The Article may then be express'd in Translation, when there can be but one Sense of the same. *Secondly*, It must be express'd, when we cannot otherwise give the Sense of the place; as *Mat. 1. 6. εν της της Ουγια, Ex ea que fuit Urias*, where the Vulgar Interpreter omits it not; but in this of *St. Paul*, which we now speak of, where the Sense is doubtful; and the *Latin* expresses the *Greek* sufficiently otherwise, he leaves it also doubtful and indifferent, not abridging it, as they do, saying, *The Grace of GOD which is with me*.

(d) Again, In this other place of the *Corinthians*, where the Apostle calls himself and his Fellow Preachers *GOD's Co-advisors, Co-labourers*, or such as labour and work with God, how falsely have their first Translatois made it, let themselves, who have Corrected it in their last Bible, judge.

(e) And in this next, the Apostles words do not signify, that *We had no strength*, or, were *without strength*; but that we were *Weak, Feeble, Infirm*: And this they corrupt to defend their False-Doctrine, *That Free-will was altogether lost by Adam's Sin*.

(f) When they have bereav'd and spoil'd a Man of his *Free-Will*, and left him without all strength, they go so far in this point, that they say, *The Regenerate themselves have not Free-Will and Ability*; no, nor by and with the Grace of God, to keep the Commandments. To this purpose, they translate, His Commandments are not *Grievous*, rather than *Are not heavy*; for in saying, *They are not heavy*, it would follow they might be kept and observed; but in saying, *They are not Grievous*, that may be true, were they never so heavy or impossible, through Patience; as when a Man cannot do as he would; yet it grieves him not, being Patient and Wise, because he is content to do as he can, and is able.

(g) Our Saviour says not, in this place of *St. Matib.* as they fafly translate, *All Men cannot, but, All Men don't*; and therefore, *St. Augustine* says, *Because all will not*: But when our Saviour says afterwards, *He that can receive, let him receive*: He adds another *Greek* word to express that Sense, *οὐ δύνασθε χαρίν χαρίσαι*; whereas by the *Protestant* fond Translation, he might have said, *οὐ μπορεῖτε χαρίσαι*. *Vid. above.*

Beza No.  
T. 1580.

Whitaker  
p. 18.

Beza in An-  
notatio.  
*Rom. 2. 27.*

St. August.  
de gra. C-  
lib. Arbitr.  
cap. 4.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Romans, cap. 5. ver. 18.	(a) <i>Igitur sicut per unius delictum in om- nes homines in Con- demnationem : sic &amp; per unius Justitiam in omnes homines in Ju- stificationem vitæ.</i>	Therefore, as by the offence of one, unto all men to Con- demnation: So also, by the Justice of one, unto all men to Ju- stification of Life.	(a) <b>Likewise then as by the offence of one, the fault came on all Men to Condemnation : So by the Justify- ing of one, the be- nefit abounded to- wards all men, to the Justification of Life.</b>	Therefore, as by the offences of one, <i>Judgment came upon</i> all men to Condem- nation: Even so by the Righteousness of one, <i>the free gift came upon</i> all Men unto Justification of Life.
Romans, cap. 4. ver. 3.	(b) <i>Credidit Abra- ham Deo &amp; reputatum est illi ad Justitiam. [sic dñgōiōvñv.]</i>	Abraham believed God, and it was re- puted him to Justice.	(b) <b>Abraham Be- lieved God, and it was reputed to him for Justice.</b>	And it was ac- counted unto him for Righteousness.
2 Corinth. cap. 5. ver. ult.	(c) <i>—Ut nos effice- remur Justitia Dei in ipso. [dñgōiōvñ vñ dñtñd.]</i>	—That we might be made the Justice of God in him.	(c) <b>That we by his means should be that Righteous- ness, which before God is allowed.</b>	That we might be made the Righteous- ness of God in him.
Ephesians, cap. 1. ver. 6.	(d) <i>In qua gratifi- cavit [iæel'wɔr] nos in dilecto filio suo.</i>	Wherein he hath gratified us in his be- loved Son.	(d) <b>Wherein he hath made us ac- cepted, [or, freely accepted] in his Beloved Son.</b>	Wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved.
Daniel, cap. 6. ver. 22.	(e) <i>—Quia co- ram eo Justitia inven- ta est in me.</i>	— Because before him, <i>Justice was found in me.</i>	(e) <b>Because be- fore him, my Ju- stice was found out.</b>	For as much as before him <i>Innocency</i> <i>was found in me.</i>
Romans, cap. 4. ver. 6.	(f) <i>Sicut &amp; David dicit [æb'væ] beatitu- dinem hominis cui De- us accepto fert Justi- tiam sine operibus.</i>	As David also termeth the blessed- ness of a Man, to whom God reputeth Justice without Works	(f) <b>As David describeth the Ble- ssedness of the Man unto whom God imputeth Righte- ousness.</b>	Instead of <i>Termeth</i> , they say, <i>Describeth</i> ; and for <i>Justice</i> , they have <i>Righteousness</i> .

(a) **B**EZZA, in his Annotations on Rom. 5. 18. protests, That his adding to this Text is especially against *Inherent Justice*, which, he says, is to be avoided as nothing more. His false Translation you see our English Bibles follow; and have added no fewer than six words in this one Verse; Yea, their last Translations have added Seven; and some of these words much different from those of their former Brethren; so that it is impossible to make them agree betwixt themselves: I cannot but admire to see how loth they are to suffer the Holy Scripture to speak in behalf of *Inherent Justice*.

(b) So also in this next place, where they add the word *For* to the Text, *And it was reputed to be him for Justice, (For Righteousness, says their last Righteous work, for the longer they live the further they are divided from Justice)* because they would have it to be nothing else, but instead and place of *Justice*; thereby taking away true *Inherent Justice*, even in *Abraham* himself. But admit this Translation of theirs (which, notwithstanding in their Sense, is False), must it needs signify not true *Inherent Justice*, because the Scripture says, it was reputed for *Justice*? Do such Speeches import, That it is not so indeed, but is only reputed so? Then if we should say, This shall be reputed to thee for Sin, for a great benefit, &c. it should signify it is no Sin indeed, nor great Benefit. But let them remember, that the Scripture uses to speak of Sin, and of Justice alike, *Reputabitur tibi in peccatum, It shall be reputed to thee for Sin*, as St. Hieron translates it. If then Justice only be reputed, Sin also is only reputed: If Sin be in us indeed, Justice is in us indeed. And the Greek Fathers make it plain, *That to be reputed unto Justice, is to be true Justice indeed*; Interpreting St. Paul's words, *That Abraham obtained Justice, Abraham was Justify'd*; for that is, say they, *It was reputed him to Justice*. And St. James, testifies, that, *In that Abraham was justified by Faith and Works, the Scripture was fulfilled*; that says, *It was reputed him to Justice*, Gen. 15. ver. 6. in which words of Genesis, there is not, *For Justice*, or, instead of *Justice*, as the English Bibles have it; for the Hebrew *בְּרִית מְשֻׁבָּח יְהָוָה* should not be so translated, especially when they mean it was so counted or reputed for *Justice*, that it was not *Justice* indeed.

(c) Again, How intolerably have their first Translations corrupted St. Paul's words (2 Cor. 5.) which, tho' their latter Bibles have undertaken to Correct, yet would not their Heretic suffer them to amend also the word *Righteousness*? It is Death to them to hear of *Justice*.

(d) Here again, they make St. Paul say, That *GOD* made us *accepted*, or, *freely accepted in his beloved Son*, (their last Translation leaves out *Son* very boldly, changing the word *His* into *The*, *Accepted in the Beloved*) as if they had a mind to say, that *In (or among) all the Beloved in the World, God has only accepted us*: as they make the Angel in St. Luke say to our Blessed Lady, *Hail, freely Beloved*, to take away all Grace inherent and resident in the B. Virgin, or in us: Whereas the Apostles word signifies that we are truly made *Grateful*, or, *Gracious* and *Acceptable*; that is to say, That our Soul is inwardly Endu'd and Beautify'd with Grace, and the Virtues proceeding from it; and consequently, is Holy indeed, before the sight of *GOD*, and not only so accepted or reputed as they imagine. Which St. Chrysostome sufficiently testifies in these words; *He said not, which he freely gave us, but, wherein he made us Grateful; that is, not only delivered us from Sins, but also made us Beloved and Amiable, made our Soul Beautiful and Grateful; such as the Angels and Arch-Angels desire to see, and such as himself is in Love withal, according to that in the Psalm, The King shall desire, or be in love with thy Beauty*. St. Hieron speaking of *Baptism*, says, *Now thou art made clean in the Laver: And of thee 'tis said, Who is she that ascends white? and let her be washed, yet she cannot keep her Purity, unless she be strengthened from our Lord*: whence is plain, That by *Baptism*, original Sin being expell'd, *Inherent Justice* takes place in the Soul, rendring it *Clean, White, and Pure*; which *Purity* the Soul, strengthned by *GOD's Grace*, may keep and conserve.

(e) Another Falsification they make here in *Daniel*, translating, *My justice was found out*; and in another Bible, *My Unguileness was found out*, to draw it from *Inherent Justice*, which was in *Daniel*. In their last Edition, you see they are resolv'd to Correct their Brethren's Fault; notwithstanding, tho' they mend one, yet they make another; putting *Innocency* instead of *Justice*: 'Tis very strange, that our English Protestant Divines should have such a peek against *Justice*, that they cannot endure to see it stand in the Text, where both the *Chaldee*, *Greek* and *Latin* place it.

(f) It must needs be a spot of the same Infection, that they translate *Describeth* here; as tho' *Imputed Righteousness*, (for so they had rather say, than *Justice*) were the *Description of Blessedness*.

Deut. c. 23.  
v. 24.  
Oecum in  
Ceson. Pbu-  
tissus.  
Cap. 2. ver.  
23.

St. Chrys.  
in this place  
of the Ephesians.

St. Hieron.  
lib. 3. confr.  
Pelagianos.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Hebrews, cap. 10. ver. 22.	(a) <i>Acedamus cum vero corde in pleni- tudine Fidei [εν την εποιεια μετεωρ.]</i>	Let us approach with a true Heart, in fulness of Faith.	(a) <b>Let us draw nigh with a true heart, in assurance of Faith.</b>	Let us draw near with a true Heart, in full assurance of Faith.
1 Corinth. cap. 13. ver. 2.	(b) <i>Et si habuero om- nem [ταῦτα] Fidem, ita ut montes transfe- ram Charitatem aut- em non habuero, nihil sum.</i>	And if I should have <i>all</i> Faith, so that I could remove Mountains, and have not Charity, I am nothing.	(b) <b>If I should have whole Faith. [Totam Fidem, faith Beza, for, Omnem Fi- dem.]</b>	<i>All</i> Faith.
1 Corinth. cap. 12. ver. 31.	<i>Et ad hoc excep- tientiorem viam vobis demonstro.</i>	And yet I shew you a <i>more excellent</i> way.	Beza in Testament 1556. translates it, <b>Behold, moreover also I shew you a way most diligently.</b>	Corrected.
St. James, cap. 2. ver. 22.	(c) <i>Vides quoniam Fides co-operabatur οντηναι operibus illius.</i>	Seest thou that Faith <i>did work</i> with his Works.	(c) <b>Thou seest that Faith was a helper of his works. Beza.</b>	Corrected.
St. Luke, cap. 18. ver. 42.	(d) <i>Et Jesus dixit illi: respice, Fides tua te Salvum fecit [ειπεις ουσιων αι.]</i>	Thy Faith hath made thee <i>whole</i> .	(d) <b>Thy Faith hath saved thee.</b>	Thy Faith hath saved thee.
St. Mark, cap. 10. ver. 52. and cap. 8. ver. 48.	<i>Vade. Fides tua te salvum fecit.</i>	Thy Faith hath made thee <i>safe</i> .	<b>Thy Faith hath saved thee.</b>	Corrected.

ALL other means of Salvation being thus taken away, as you have already seen, their only and last Refuge is **ONLY FAITH**; and the same not the Christian Faith of the Articles of the Creed, and such like; but a special Faith and Confidence, whereby every Man must assuredly Believe, that Himself is the Son of God, and one of the Elect and Predestinate to Salvation. If he be not, by *Faith*, as sure of this, as of Christ's Incarnation and Death, he shall never be Saved.

(a) For the maintaining of this Heresie, they force the *Greek* to express the very word of *Affurance* and *Certainty*, thus; *Let us draw nigh with a true Heart, in Assurance of Faith*: Their last Translation makes it, *In full Assurance of Faith*: adding the word *full* to what it was before; and that, either because they would be thought to draw that word from the Original, or else because they would thereby signify such an *Affurance* or *Certainty*, as should be beyond all manner of doubt or fear; thereby excluding not only *Charity*, but even *Hope* also, as unnecessary.

The *Greek* is far different from their Expression; for it signifies, properly, the Fulness and Complement of any thing; and therefore the Apostle joyns it sometimes with *Faith*, sometimes with *Hope*, (as in *Heb. 6. ver. 11.*) sometimes with *Knowledge* or *Understanding*, (*Col. 2. ver. 2.*) to signify the Fulness of all Three, as the Vulgar *Latin* Interpreter most sincerely (*Rom. 4. ver. 21.*) translates it. Thus when the *Greek* signifies *Fulness of Faith*, rather than *Full Assurance* (or as *Beza* has it, *Certain Perswasion*) of *Faith*, they err in the precise Translation of it; and much more do they err in the Sense, when they apply it to the *Certain* and *Affured Faith* that every Man ought to have (as they say) of his own Salvation. Whereas the *Greek* Fathers Expound it of the *Fulness of Faith*, that every Faithful Man must have of all such things in Heaven, as he sees not; namely, That *CHRIST* is Ascended thither, That He shall come with Glory to judge the World, &c. Adding further, and proving out of the Apostles words next following, That (the Protestants) *only Faith is not sufficient, be it never so special or assured*.—For the said reason do they also translate, *The special Gift of Faith*, (*Sap. 3. 14.*) instead of, *The chosen gift of Faith*. Another gross Corruption have they in *Ecclesiasticus*, *cap. 5. ver. 5.* But because, in their Bibles of the latter Stamp, they have rejected these Books, as not Canonical (tho' they can shew us no more Reason or Authority for their so doing, than for Altering and Corrupting the Text) I shall be content to pass it by.

(b) *Beza*, by Corrupting this place of the *Corinthians*, (translating *Totam Fidem* for *Omnem Fidem*) thinks to exempt from the Apostles Words, their special Justifying *Faith*; whereas it may be easily seen, that *St. Paul* names and means *All Faith*, as he doth *All Knowledge*, and *All Mysteries*, in the fore-going words. And *Luther* confesses, That he thrust the word *only* [*Only Faith*] into the *Text*.

(c) Also by his Falsifying this Text of *St. James*, he would have his Reader to think, (as he also expounds it) *That Faith was an Efficient Cause, and fruitful of Good Works*; whereas the Apostles words are plain, That *Faith* wrought together with his *works*; yea, and that his *Faith* was by *Works* made perfect. This is Impudent handling of Scripture, to make *Works* the *Fruit* only, and *Effect* of *Faith*; which is their Heresie.

(d) Again, In all those places of the *Gospel*, where our Blessed Saviour requires the Peoples *Faith*, when he heald them of Corporal Diseases only; they gladly translate, *Thy Faith hath saved thee*, rather than, *Thy Faith hath heald thee*; or, *Thy Faith hath made thee whole*. And this they do, that by joyning these words together, they may make it found in the Ears of the People, That *Faith* saves and justifies a Man: For so *Beza* notes in the Margent, *Fides Salvat, Faith Saveth*: Whereas the *Faith* that was here required, was of *Christ's Omnipotency* only, and *Power*; which *Beza* confesses, may be in the Devils themselves; and is far from the *Faith* that Justifies.

But they will say, The *Greek* signifies as they translate: I grant it does so; but it signifies very commonly to be healed Corporally; as (by their own Translation) in these places, *Mark 5. ver. 26. Luk. 8. ver. 36, 48, 50.* and in other places, where they translate, *I shall be whole*, *They were Healed, He was Healed, She shall be made whole*. And why do they here translate so? Because they know, *To be Saved*, imports rather the *Salvation* of the *Soul*: And therefore, when *Faith* is joyn'd with it, they translate rather *Saved* than *Healed*, to insinuate their *Justification* by *Only Faith*.

But how contrary to the *Doctrine* of the *Ancient Fathers* this *Protestant* Error of *Only Faith* *Falsifying* is, may be seen by those who pleases to read *St. Augustin, De Fide & Opero*, c. 14.

To conclude, I will refer my *Protestant* Solifidian to the *Words* of *St. James* the *Apostle*; where he will find that *Faith* alone, without *Works*, cannot Save him.

St. Chrys.  
Theodoret.  
Theophyl.  
upon Rom.  
10.  
St. Chrys.  
Hom. 19. c.  
10. ad Heb.

Luther, To.  
2. fol. 405.  
Edit. Witte.  
Anno 1551

Beza. 4. 11.  
in 1 C. 1.  
13. 2.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
II Thessal. cap. 2. ver. 15.	(a) <i>Itaque Fratres state &amp; tenete Tra- ditiones [περιδοσις] quas didicistis, sive per sermonem sive per Epistolam nostram.</i>	Therefore, Bre- thren, stand and hold the <i>Traditions</i> which you have learned, whether it be by Word, or by our Epistle.	(a) For <i>Traditi- ons</i> , they say, <b>Ordi- nances</b> .	Corrected.
II Thessal. cap. 3. ver. 6.	— <i>Ut subtraha- tis vos ab omni fratre ambulante inordinate, &amp; non secundum Tra- ditionem, quam acce- perunt a nobis.</i>	— That you with- draw your selves from every Brother walking inordinate- ly, and not accord- ing to the <i>Tradition</i> which they have re- ceived of us.	Instead of <i>Trad- ition</i> , they translate, <i>Instructions</i> .	Corrected.
I Corinth. cap. 11. ver. 2.	<i>Laudo autem vos fratres quod per om- nia mei memores estis, &amp; sicut tradidi vobis, Precepta mea tenetis. [εχοντες μνησις, τις μα- γειροντες κατηχηντες.]</i>	And I praise you Brethren, that in all things you be mind- ful of me, and as I have delivered unto you, you keep my Precepts.	— <b>And keep the Ordinances, as I have Preached unto you.</b>	— And keep the Ordinances, as I have delivered them to you.
Colloſſians cap. 2. ver. 20.	(b) <i>Si ergo mortui estis cum Christo ab Elementis hujus Mun- di: quid ad hoc tanguam viventes in mundo decernitis. [η δογματιζετε.]</i>	(b) If then you be dead with Christ from the Elements of this World, why do you yet decree as living in the World?	(b) <b>If ye be dead with Christ from the rudi- ments of the World, why, as though living in the World. Are ye led with Traditions? And, Are ye bur- thened with Tra- ditions?</b>	— Why, as tho living in the World, are you <b>Subject to Ordinances</b> ?
I Peter, cap. 1. ver. 18.	(c) <i>Scientes quod non corruptibilis au- ro vel argento re- dempti estis de vana vestra conversatione Paternae traditionis. [ει την ματαλας ηνων διασεργησης ματερας μεγα- τε.]</i>	(c) Knowing that not with corruptible things, Gold or Sil- ver, you are redeem- ed from your vain conversation of your Fathers Tradition.	(c) <b>You were not Redeemed with Corruptible things, Gold or Silver, from your vain conversation received by the Tra- dition of the Fathers.</b>	— From your vain conversation re- ceived by <i>Tradition</i> from your Fathers.

A General Mark, wherewith all *Hereticks*, that have ever disturb'd GOD's Church, have been branded, is, *To reject Apostolical Traditions*, and to fly to the *Scripture*, as by themselves Expounded, for their *ONLY Rule of Faith*. We read not of any Heresie since the Apostles Time, in which this Character has been more deeply stamp'd, than in those of this last Age, especially the first Heads of them; and those who were the Interpreters and Translators of the *Scriptures*; who we find to have been possest with such Prejudice against *Apostolical Tradition*, that wheresoever the *Holy Scripture* speaks against certain Traditions of the *Jews*, there all the *English Translations* follow the *Greek* exactly, never omitting to translate the *Greek* word, [παραδοσις] *Tradition*. Contrariwise, Wheresoever the *Sacred Text* speaks in commendation of *Traditions*; to wit, such *Traditions* as the Apostles delivered to the Church, there (a) all their first Translations agree not to follow the *Greek*, which is still the self-same word; but for *Traditions*, translate *Ordinances* or *Instructions*, *Preachings*, *Institutions*, and any word else, rather than *Tradition*: Infomuch, that *Beza*, the Master of our *English Scripturists*, translates the word [παραδοσις] *Traditam Doctrinam*, the *Doctrine delivered*, putting the Singular Number for the Plural, and adding *Doctrine* of his own accord.

2. The *Text*.  
2. 3.

Who could imagine, that their Malice and Partiality against *Traditions* were so great, that they should all agree (in their first Translations I mean; for they could not but Blush at it in their last) with one consent so duly and exactly, in all these places (set down in the former *Page*) to conceal and suppress the word *Tradition*, which, in other places, they do so gladly make use of? I appeal to their Consciences, whether these things were not done on purpose, and with a very wicked Intention, to signifie to the *Reader*; that all *Traditions* are to be reprov'd and rejected, and none allow'd?

(b) In some places, they do so gladly use this word *Tradition*, that rather than want it, they make bold to thrust it into the *Text*, when it is not in the *Greek* at all; as you see in this place of the Epistle to the *Colossians*. --- *Why, as tho' living in the World, are you led with Traditions?* and as another *English Bible* reads more Heretically, *Why are ye Burthened with Traditions*. Doubtless, they knew as well then, as they do now at this day, that this *Greek* word [διδυμα] doth not signify *Tradition*; yea, they were not Ignorant, when a little before, in the same Chapter, and in other places, themselves translate [διδυμα] *Ordinances*, *Decrees*. Was not this done then, to make the very Name of *Tradition* Odious among the People?

Bib. 1579.

Col. 2. 14.  
Eph. 2. 15.

And tho' some of these gross Corruptions are Corrected by their last Translators; yet we have no reason to think they were Amended out of any good or pure Intention, but the rather to defend some of their own *Traditions*, viz. Wearing of the *Rochet*, *Surplices*, *Four-corner'd Cap*, keeping the first day in the Week *Holy*, *Baptizing Infants*, &c. All which things being deny'd by their more refin'd Brethren, as not being clearly to be prov'd out of *Scripture*; and they having no other refuge to fly to but *Tradition*, were forced to translate *Tradition* in some places, where it is well spoken of. But, I say, this could not be out of any pure Intention of Correcting the Corrupted *Scripture*; but rather for the said self-end, which appears evidently enough from their not also Correcting other notorious Falsifications, (as 1 Pet. 1. 18.) (c) *You were not redeemed with Corruptible things, from your vain Conversation received by Tradition from your Fathers*; where the *Greek* [εν την ματας ιητων παραδοσιν παρεπαραδοσι] is rather to be thus translated, (and 'tis the *Greek* they pretend to follow, and not our *Vulgar Latin*, which they condemn) *From your vain Conversation delivered by the Fathers*: But because it sounds with the Simple People, to be spoken against the *Traditions* of the *Roman Church*, they were as glad to suffer it to pass; as the former Translators were, for the same reason, to foist in the word *Tradition*; and for *Delivered*, to say, *Received*: I say, because it is the Phrase of the *Catholick Church*, That it *has received* many things by *Tradition*, which they would here Controul by likeness of Words, in their False Translations. But concerning the word *Tradition*, they will tell us, perhaps, The Sense thereof is included in the *Greek Word*, *Delivered*: We grant it. But would they be content, if we should always expressly add *Tradition*, where 'tis so included? Then should we say in the *Corinthians*, *I praise you, that as I have delivered to you (by Tradition) you keep my Precepts or Traditions*. — And again, *For I received of our Lord, which also I delivered unto you (by Tradition)*. — And in another place, *As they (by Tradition) delivered unto us, which from the Beginning far, &c. and such like*, by their Example, we should translate in this sort. But we use not this *Licentious manner* in translating *Holy Scriptures*; neither is it a Translators part, but an Interpreters, and his that makes a

1 Cor. 11.2.  
& ver. 23.  
Luk. 1. 7.2.

Commentary: Nor does a good Cause need other Translation, than the express Text of the Scripture gives.

Put if you say, That our Vulgar *Latin* has, in this place, the word *Tradition*; We grant it has so; and therefore, we also translate accordingly: But you (as I hinted above) profess to translate the *Greek*, and not our Vulgar *Latin*, which you condemn as Papistical, and say it is the worst of all, (tho' *Beza*, your Master, pronounces it to be the very best): And will you, notwithstanding, follow the said Vulgar *Latin*, rather than the *Greek*, when you find it seem to make for your purpose? This is your Partiality and Inconstancy. One while you will follow it, tho' it differ from the *Greek*; and another time you reject it, tho' it agree with the *Greek* most exactly; as we have shewn you above (*Col. 2. 20.*) where the Vulgar *Latin* hath nothing of *Traditions*, but, *Quid decernitis*, as it is in the *Greek*; yet there your sincere Brethren translate, *Why are ye burthened with Traditions?*

Is not all this to Bolster up their Errors and Heresies, without all respect of following sincerely, either the *Greek* or *Latin*? The *Greek*, at least, why do they not follow? Doth the *Greek* [*παράδοσις*] induce them to say, *Ordinances for Traditions?* Or [*σύγκλητον*] lead them to say, *Traditions for Decrees?* Or [*δικαιώματα, πρεσβύτερος, ἄρνη, εἰδώλος, &c.*] force them to translate *Ordinances for Justifications*, *Elder for Priest*, *Grave for Hell*, *Image for Idol*, &c.? No! Where they are afraid of disadvantaging their Heresies, they scruple not to reject and forsake both the *Greek* and *Latin*.

Tho' *Protestants*, in the last Translation of the Bible, have indeed Corrected this Error in several places (not in all) on purpose, thereby to defend themselves against their Puritannical Brethren, when they charge them with several Popish Observations, Ceremonies, and Traditions, which they cannot maintain by Scripture alone, without being forc'd (as is said) to fly to unwritten *Traditions*: Yet, when they either Dispute with, or Write against *Catholics*, they utterly deny *Traditions*, and stick fast to the Scripture *ALONE*, for their *ONLY Rule of Faith*: Falshy Asserting, That the Scripture was receiv'd by the Primitive Church, as a *Perfect Rule of Faith*.

These are the Words of a late Ministerial \* Guide of the Church of *England*, *The Scripture was yet (viz. when St. *Augustin* was sent into *England*) received as a *PERFECT RULE OF FAITH*:* For which he cites other Authority like his own. But how true this is, let the Holy Fathers of the first Five Hundred Years satisfie us.

St. *Chrysostome*, Expounding the Words of St. *Paul*, (*2 Thess. cap. 15.*) affirms, *That hereby it appears, that the Apostles did not deliver all things by Epistle, but many things without Writing; and these are worthy of Faith: Wherefore also, let us esteem the Tradition of the Church to be believed. It is a Tradition, seek no further.*

And the same Exposition is given by St. *Basil*, *Theophilakt*, and St. *Jo. Damascene*: As also by St. *Epiphanius*; who says, *We must use Tradition, for all things cannot be receiv'd from Divine Scripture; wherefore the Holy Apostles have delivered some Things by Tradition: Even as the Holy Epistle says, As I have Deliver'd to you, and else-where; so I Teach, and have Delivered in the Churches.*

St. *Augustin* proving, That those who were Baptized by Hereticks, should not be Rebaptiz'd, says, *The Apostles Commanded nothing hereof; but that Doctrine which was opposed herein against Cyprian, is to be believ'd to proceed from their Tradition, as many things be, which the Church holds; and are therefore well believ'd to be Commanded of the Apostles, altho' they are not Written.* These words, of this great Doctor, are so clear, That Mr. \* *Cartwright*, a *Protestant*, speaking thereof, says, *To allow St. Augustins Words, is to bring in Popery again.* And in another place †, *If St. Augustin's Judgment be a good Judgment, then there be some things Commanded of GOD, which are not in the Scriptures; and thereupon no sufficient Doctrine contain'd in the Scriptures.* How to make all this agree with the Doctrine of our now Ministerial Guides of the Church of *England*, who Teach, That in those Primitive Times, *The Scripture was receiv'd as a Perfect and Only Rule of Faith*, will be a Task, that, I am confident, no Wise Man, that has either Honour, Credit, or Respect for *Truth*, will venture to undertake.

*Discover.*  
*of the Rock,*  
*p. 147.*  
*Beza Pref.*  
*in Novum*  
*Tefta. 1556.*

\* See the Pamphlet,  
call'd, a Second Def.  
of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Ch. of Engl. &c.  
p. 13. N. 24.  
St. Chrys.  
in 2 Thess.  
Hom. 4.  
See St. Basil  
de Spirit.  
Sanc. c. 29.  
Theophil.  
in 2 Thes. 2.  
Damasc. c.  
17. de Imag.  
Sanc.  
St. Ephiph.  
Hær. 61.  
St. Aug.  
de Bapt.  
contr. Don.  
ib. 5. c. 23.  
\* In Whig.  
Def. p. 103.  
† And his  
Second Rep.  
ag. Whig.  
Part 1. pag.  
21, 85, 86.

# An Heret. Translation against the Sacram. of MARRIAGE. 69

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bible, Edit. Lond. An. Dom. 1683.
Ephesians, cap. 5. ver. 32.	Sacramentum [superior] hoc magnum est.	This is a great Sacrament.	This is a great Secret.	This is a great Mystery.

The Church of God esteems *Marriage* an Holy Sacrament, as giving Grace to the Married Persons, to live together in Love, Concord, and Fidelity. But *Protestants*, who reckon it no more than a Civil Contract, as it is among Infidels, did Translate this Text accordingly, calling it (in their first Translations) instead of a *Great Sacrament*, (or *Mystery*, as in the *Greek*) a *Great Secret*.

But we will excuse them for not translating *Sacrament*, because they pretended not to translate the *Latin*, but the *Greek*: Yet, however we must ask them, Why they call'd it not *Mystery*, as it is in the *Greek*? doubtles they can give us no other reason, but only for avoiding both those words which are us'd in the *Latin* and *Greek* Church, to signifie *Sacrament*; for the word *Mystery* is the same in *Greek*, that *Sacrament* is in *Latin*: And in the *Greek* Church, the Sacrament of the *Body* and *Blood* it self, is called by the Name of *Mystery* or *Mysteries*; so that, if they should have call'd *Matrimony* by that Name, it would have sounded to be a *Sacrament* also: But in saying, *it is a great Secret*, they are sure it shall not be taken for a *Sacrament*.

But perhaps they will say, Is not every *Sacrament* and *Mystery* in *Enzlish*, a *Secret*? Yes, as *Angel*, is a *Messenger*; *Priest*, an *Elder*; *Apostle*, *One that is sent*; *Baptism*, *Washing*; *Evangelist*, a *Bringer of Good News*; *Holy Ghost*, *Holy Wind*; *Bishop*, *Over-seer* or *Super-intendent*: But when the Holy Scripture uses these words to signifie more excellent and Divine things than those of the common sort, pray does it become Translators to use *Profane* instead of *Ecclesiastical* Terms, and thereby to disgrace the writing and meaning of the Holy Ghost?

The same *Greek* word in all other places † they translated *Mystery*; who therefore can imagine any other reason for their translating of it *Secret* in this place, than lest it might seem to make against their Heretical Opinion, [That *Marriage* is no *Sacrament*?] tho' the Apostle makes it such a *Mystery*, (or *Sacrament*) as represents no less than the Conjunction of *Christ* and his *Church*, and whatsoever is most excellent in that Conjunction.

And St. *Augustine* teaches, That — *A certain Sacrament of Marriage is commended to the Faithful that are Marry'd; whereupon the Apostle says, Husbands, Love your Wives, as Christ loved the Church.* And *Fulk* grants, That *Augustin and some others of the Ancient Fathers take it, That Matrimony is a great Mystery of the Conjunction of Christ, and his Church.*

But because they have kept to the *Greek* in their last Translation, I shall say no more of it; nor indeed had I taken thus much notice of it, but to shew the Reader how Intollerably *Partial* and *Crafty* they were in their first Translations.

Here follow several Heretical *ADDITIONS*, and other Notorious Fal-sifications, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Tim. 3. Col. 1. ver. 26. Ephel. 3. ver. 9. 1 Cor. 15. ver. 51. St Aug. de Nupt. & Concup. lib. 1. c. 10. Fulk in Euseb. Test. in Ephel. 5. 32. Sch. 5

## Heretical Corruptions

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
2 Paralip. or Chron. cap. 36. ver. 8.	(a) <i>Reliqua autem verborum Joakim, &amp; abominationem ejus, quas operatus est &amp; qua inventa sunt in eo continentur in libro Regum Judæ &amp; Is- rael.</i>	But the rest of the words of Joakim, and of his Abominations which he wrought, and the things that were found in him, are contained in the Book of the Kings of Juda and Israel.	(a) <b>The rest of the Acts of Ieho- akin, and his Abo- minations which he did, [And carved Images that were laid to his charge ] behold they are written in the Book of the Kings of Juda and Israel.</b>	Corrected.
Acts Apost. cap. 9. ver. 22.	(b) <i>Et confun- det Judæos qui habi- tabant Damasci affir- mans quoniam hic est Christus.</i>	And confounded the Jews, &c. affirming that this is Christ.	(b) <b>Saul con- founded the Jews, probing [ by con- ferring one Scripture with another ] that this is very Christ.</b>	Corrected.
1 St. Peter, cap. 1. ver. 25.	(c) <i>Verbum autem Domini manet in Æ- ternum ; Hoc est au- tem Verbum quod E- vangelizatum est in vos.</i>	But the word of our Lord remaineth for ever ; And this is the Word that is Evangelized among you.	(c) <b>The word of the Lord endu- reth for ever : And this is the word which [ by the Go- spel ] was Preach- ed unto you.</b>	----- And this is the Word, which [ by the Gospel ] is Preached unto you.
St. James, cap. 4. ver. 6.	(d) <i>Majorem au- tem dat Gratiam.</i>	And giveth greater Grace.	(d) <b>But [ the Scripture ] offereth greater Grace.</b>	But <b>He</b> giveth more Grace.
Collofians cap. 1. ver. 23.	(e) <i>Si tamen per- manetis in Fide fun- dati, &amp; stabiles, &amp; immobiles à spe Evan- gelii quod audistis, quod prædicatum est in universa Creatura que sub Cælo est.</i>	If yet ye continue in the Faith grounded and stably, and unmovable from the Hope of the Gospel which you have heard, which is Preached among all Creatures, &c.	(e) <b>If ye conti- nue stablished in the Faith, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel, which you have heard [ how it was ] Preached. — Or, [ whereof ] ye have heard [ how that it ] is Preached. — Or, [ whereof ] ye have heard, [ and which hath been ] Preach- ed.</b>	----- Which ye have heard, [ and which was ] Preached to every Creature.

(a) [ Have not set down these few Examples of their Additions, as if they were all the places in the Bible, that were Corrupted after this manner; for if you observe well in the fore-going Chapters, you will find both *Additions* and *Diminutions*: And that ~~is~~ frequently done, and with such wonderful boldness, as if these Translators had been Priviledg'd by especial License to *Add* to, or *Diminish* from the Sacred Text at their pleasures: Or, as if *Themselves* had been only *Excepted* from that general Curse denounc'd, against all such, as either *Add* to, or *Diminish* from it, in the close of the Holy Bible ( *Apocalips 22. ver. 18, 19.* ) in these Words, *For I Testifie to every One, hearing the Words of the Prophecie of this Book: If any Man shall add to these things, GOD shall add unto him the Plagues written in this Book. And if any Man sha'l diminish of the Words of the Book of this Prophecy, GOD shall take away his part out of the Book of Life, and out of the Holy City, and of these things that be Written in this Book.* ]

Against *Holy Images* they maliciously *Add* to the Text, these words, [ *Carved Images, that were laid to his charge.* ] And to what intent is this, but to deceive the Ignorant Reader, and to foment his hatred against the Images of *CHRIST*, and his Saints? As they have done also in another place, ( *Rom. 11. 4.* ) where they maliciously *Add* the word [ *Image* ] to the Text, where it is not in the Greek, saying instead of, *I have left me Seven Thousand Men, who have not bowed their Knees to Baal;* thus, *I have left me Seven Thousand Men, who have not bowed the Knee to [ the Image of ] Baal.*

Bible 1562

(b) [ *By conferring one Scripture with another:* ] This is added more than is in the Greek, in favour of their presumptuous Opinion, That Conference of *Scriptures* is enough for any Man to understand them himself, and solely by his own diligence and endeavour; and thereby to reject both the *Commentaries* of the *Doctors*, and the *Exposition* of *Holy Councils*, and the *Catholic* Church.

Bible 1577

(c) [ *By the Gospel:* ] These words are added Deceitfully, and of ill Intent, to make the simple Reader think, that there is no other Word of *GOD*, but the Written Word: for the common Reader hearing this word *Gospel*, conceives nothing else. But indeed all is *Gospel*, whatsoever the *Apostles* Taught, either by *Writing*, or by *Tradition*, and *Word of Mouth*.

Lind. *Dis-*  
*bitat.* p. 88.

It is written of *Luther*, That in his First *Translation* of the *Bible* into the *German Tongue*, he left out these Words of the *Apostle* clearly [ *This is the Word which is Evangeliz'd to you* ]; because *St. Peter* does here define what is the Word of *GOD*; saying, *That which is Preached to you, and not that Only which is Written.*

(d) In this place they add to the Text, the words [ *The Scripture;* ] where the *Apostle* may say as well, and indifferently, [ *The Spirit or Holy Ghost* ] gives more Graces, as is more probable he meant, and is so Expounded of many. And so also this last *Translation* of theirs intimates, by putting to the Word, *He*, [ *But He giveth more Grace* ], tho' this is more than they know how to stand by. But they will never be brought from Inserting their *Commentary* in the Text, and restraining the *Holy Ghost* to one particular Sense, where his Words seem to be Ambiguous, which the *Latin Interpreter* never presumed to do; but always leaves it as open to either signification in the *Latin*, as he found it in *Greek*.

(e) In this last place, they alter the *Apostles* plain *Speech*, with certain words of their own; for they will not have him say, *Be unmovable in the Faith and Gospel, which you have heard, which has been Preached;* but, *Whereof you have heard how it was Preached;* as tho' he spake not of the *Gospel* Preached to them, but of a *Gospel* which they had only heard of, that was Preached in the *World*.

The *Apostle* Exhorts the *Colloſians* to continue grounded in the *Faith* and *Gospel*, which they had heard and received of their first *Apostles*. But our *Protestants*, who with *Hymenaeus* and *Alexander*, and other Old Hereticks, have fallen from their first *Faith*, approve not of this *Exhortation*.

*1 Tim. cap.*  
*1. ver. 6.*

'Tis certain, that these words, [ *Whereof you have heard how it was Preached* ] are not so in the *Greek*; but, [ *Which you have heard, which has been Preached* ]: As if it were said, That they should continue constant in the *Faith* and *Gospel*, which themselves had receiv'd, and which was then Preach'd and receiv'd in the whole *World*.

In *Cor. cap. 14. ver. 4.* where 'tis said, *He that speaketh with Tongues, Edifieth himself;* the *Bible Printed 1683.* translates thus, *He that speaketh in an [ unknown ] Tongue, Edifieth himself:* So likewise in the *13, 14, 19, and 27th.* Verifies, they make the same *Addition*: So that in this one *Chapter* they add the word [ *Unknown* ] no less than Five times to the *Text*, where it is not in the *Greek*. And this they do, on purpose to make it seem to the Ignorant People, That *Mass* and other

*Eccle-*

## Heretical Corruptions

Ecclesiastical Offices ought not to be said in *Latin*: Whereas here is nothing, either Written or Meant of any other Tongues, but such as Men spoke in the Primitive Church by Miracle; to wit, Barbarous and strange Tongues, which could not be Interpreted commonly, but by the Miraculous Gift also of Interpretation: And tho' also they might by Miracle speak the *Latin, Greek or Hebrew Tongues*; yet these could not be counted *Unknown Tongues*, as being the common Languages of the World, and of the Faithful, and understood of the Learned in every City; and in which also the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were Written; which could not be said to have been Written in an *Unknown Tongue*, tho' they were not Penn'd in the Vulgar Language, peculiar to all People; but in a Learned and known Speech, Interpretable by Thousands in every Country, tho' not by every Illiterate Person.

I would gladly know of our Translators, what moved them to add the word [*Unknown*] in some places, and not in other some, where the *Greek* Word is the same in all? for Instance, In the Fifth Verse of this Chapter, where the Apostle wisheth that all spake with *Tongues*; they translate exactly according to the *Greek*, without adding to the Text; when in all the other places, where they think there may be some shadow or colour of having it meant of the general Tongue, and known Language of the Church, they Partially, and with a very Ill-meaning, thrust in the word *Unknown*. See the Annotations upon this place, in the *Rhemish Testament*.

Again, *Rom. 12. ver. 6, 7.* where the Apostles words are, *Having Gifts according to the Grace that is given us, different, either Prophecy according to the Rule of Faith; or Ministry, in Ministering; or He that Teaches, in Doctrine*: They, by adding several Words of their own, not found in the *Greek*, and altering others, make the Text run thus, — *Having then Gifts, differing according to the Grace that is given us, whether Prophecy [let us Prophesie] according to the Proportion of Faith; or Ministry [let us wait on our] Ministering; or he that Teaches on Teaching*.

Besides their Additions here, they pervert the Text, by changing the word [*Rule*] of Faith, into [*Proportion*] of Faith: whereby they would have their Readers to gather no more from this place, than only that their New Ministers are to *Prophecy* or *Preach*, and *wait on their Ministering*, according to the *Measure* or *Proportion* of Faith or Ability, less or more, that they are endu'd with. Whereas, by this Text, as also by many other places of Holy Writ, we may gather, that the Apostles, by Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, before they divided themselves into divers Nations, made among themselves a certain *R U L E*, and *Form* of Faith and Doctrine, containing not only the Twelve Articles of the *Creed*, but all other Principles, Grounds, and the whole Platform of Christian Religion: which *Rule* was before any of the Books of the New-Testament were Written, and before the Faith was Preach'd among the Gentiles: by which *Rule*, not only the *Doctrine* of all other Inferior Teachers was to be try'd; but also the *Preaching*, *Writing*, and *Interpreting* (which is here call'd *Prophecying*) of the Apostles and Evangelists themselves, were of *G O D*'s Church approv'd and admitted, or reprov'd and rejected according to this *Rule of Faith*. This *Form* or *Rule* every Apostle deliver'd by Word of Mouth, not by Scripture, to the Country by them Converted; which was also by the Apostolical Men, and those who receiv'd it entire from the Apostles, deliver'd also entire to the next following Age; which also receiving it from them, deliver'd it, as they had receiv'd it, to the succeeding Age, &c. till this our present Age.

And this is the sure Analogy of *Faith*, set down and commended to us every where for *APOSTOLICAL TRADITION*; and not the Phantaftical Rule or Square, which every *Ministerial Guide*, according to his great or small *Proportion* of *Faith*, pretends to gather out of the *Scriptures*, as understood by his own private *Spirit*, and wrested to his *Heretical* purpose; by which he will presume to judge of, and censure the Fathers, Councils, Church, yea, the *Scripture* it self. In the Primitive Church, as also in the Church of *G O D*, at this day, all *Teaching*, *Preaching*, and *Prophecying* is not measur'd according to the proportion of every Mans private and peculiar *Spirit*, but by this *Rule of Faith*, first set down and delivered by the Apostles: And therefore, whatsoever Novelties or Prophecyings will not abide this *Text*, they are justly, by the Apostles, condemn'd, as contrary and against the *Rule of Faith* thus delivered

I can't omit taking notice, in this place, of two *Notorious* and *Gross Corruptions* in their first Translation, seeing they so much concern the *Church of England's Priesthood*; The first is in *Acts 1. ver. 26.* where, instead of saying, *He [Mathias] was numbered with the Eleven*; they translate, *He was [by a common consent] counted with the Eleven*. The other (already mentioned) is, *Acts*

14. ver. 22. where, for [When they had ordain'd to them Priests in every Church,] they say, When they had Ordained [Elders by Election] in every Congregation. In one of these Texts, the words [by a common consent], and in the other [by Election] are added on purpose to make the Scripture speak in defence of their making Super-Intendants, and Elders by Election only, without Consecration and Ordination, by Imposition of Hands: By which corrupt Additions it evidently appears to have been the Doctrine of the Church of England, in those days, that ELECTION only, without Consecration, was sufficient to make Bishops and Priests.

But in their last Translation, made in the beginning of King James the First's Reign, they have Corrected these places, by expunging the Words formerly added. And this was done by the Bishops and Clergy, for their greater Honor, Dignity, and Authority; knowing that Consecration (which they thought now high time to pretend to) must needs elevate them much above the Sphere of a bare Election, in which they formerly mov'd. And perhaps, another no less prevalent Reason was, that they might more securely fix Themselves in their Bishopricks and Benefices; thinking, perhaps, that Bishops Consecrated might pretend to that Jure Divino, which Men only Elected by the Congregation or Prince, held at the Mercy and good liking of the Electors: What other Motives induc'd them to this, matters not. However, they thought it now convenient to pretend to something more than a bare Election, to wit, to receive an Episcopal and Priestly Character, by Imposition of Hands: Whereas we find not, that their Predecessors, Parker, Jewel, Horn, &c. ever pretended to any other Character, than what they receiv'd by the Queens Letters Patents, Election, and an Act of Parliament; as is plain from the 23. and 25. of their 39 Articles, as well as from the Statute 8. Eliz. 1. and therefore were content to have the Scripture read, *He was, by a common consent, counted with the Eleven; and, When they had Ordained Elders by Election.*

And whereas our present Ministerial Guides\* of the Church of England, would gladly have People believe them to have a Succession of Bishops from the Apostolick Times to this day; Yet so far was M. Parker, Jewel, and the rest of their first Bishops, from pretending to any such Episcopal Succession, [If they had been truly Consecrated, they must of necessity have own'd and maintain'd a Succession among them] that on the contrary, they Publish'd and Preach'd many things to discredit the same: And to that purpose Falsify'd and Corrupted the Scripture against Succession. For in the Defence of the Apology † of the Church of England, they Write thus, — By Succession, CHRIST saith, that Desolation shall sit in the Holy Place, and Antichrist shall press in to the room of CHRIST; for Proof of which, they note in the Margent, Mat. 24. And in another place of the same Defence, they say of Succession; St. Paul says to the Faithful at Ephesus, I know that after my departure hence, Ravening Wolves shall enter and succeed me; and out of your selves there shall, by Succession, spring up Men speaking perversely: Whereas St. Paul has never a word of Succession or Succeeding; Nor is Succession nam'd in the 24th. of St. Matthew. So that you see, the First Bishops of the Church of England, not only Corrupted the Sacred Text, in Translating many places of the Bible against Ordination; but also, in their other Writings, Falsify'd the Scripture with their corrupt Additions against Succession\*: Two sufficient Reasons for us to believe, that they neither Had nor Pretended to either Consecration, or Episcopal Succession in those Days; consequently were not Consecrated at Lambeth, by such as had receiv'd their Consecration and Character from Roman Catholick Bishops, who claim it no otherwise than by an un-interrupted Succession from the Apostles, and so from CHRIST. And this obliges me to digress a little into

Some Considerations of those Lambeth-Records, by which Protestant Bishops endeavour to prove the Consecration of their first Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, Dr. Matthew Parker.

In the Beginning of King James the First's Reign, a New Translation of the Bible being undertaken, the said Falsifications of Scripture Corrected, and a full Resolution put on of Assuming to Themselves the Character of Consecrated Bishops and Priests; they thought it absolutely necessary to derive this Character from such Bishops as had been (as they thought) Consecrated by Roman Catholick Bishops; by whose Hand's they would now make the World believe, the

\* Dr. Tenison and A. B. in the Speculum Consider'd, p. 49. tell us, That in the C. of England they have a Succession of Bishops continued down from the Apostolick Times to this day: But to Name or Number them, they say is neither Necessary nor Useful; They might have added, nor POSSIBLE. † See the Defence of the Apol. pag. 132 and pag. 127. \* The first Protestant Bishops and Clergy were so far from pretending to either Consecration or Succession, that they Corrupted the Scripture against both. The Lambeth Records Consider'd.

See Fitzherbert's Appendix to the Discovery of Dr. Andrews Aburdities, Falsities and Lies, Printed Anno 1613.

We also at this day still urge our Protestant Bishops to prove their Succession. But they, instead of doing it, were w<sup>th</sup> these words, To Name or Number our Bishops, is neither useful nor necessary. Vid. Supy.

See Stapleton's return of Un-truths. His Challenge to Jewel and Horn, and his Counterblast against Horn.

First of their Predecessors [Matthew Parker] was Consecrated with great Solemnity at Lambeth: To which purpose they presume to obtrude upon the World certain (before unheard of) Records or Registers. But the Age, in which the Sun first shone upon these Records (viz. Anno 1613.) not being so easily Impos'd upon as was expected, the said Lambeth-Register became suspected; and, for divers Reasons, detected, as a Forg'd Instrument. Fitz-Herbert, a Man of great Sincerity and Authority, writ against these Lambeth Records, in the very Year that Mr. Mason (Work-Man to Dr. Abbot, Arch Bishop of Canterbury) first Publish'd them to the World.

These are his Words: — “ It was my chance to understand, that one Mr. Mason has lately Publish'd a Book, wherein he endeavours to prove the Consecration of the first Protestant Bishops, by a Register, testifying, that Four Bishops Consecrated Mat. Parker, the first Arch-Bishop of Canterbury. Thou shalt therefore understand, Good Reader, That this our Exception, touching the lawful Vocation and Consecration of the first Protestant Bishops in the late Queen's day, is not a New Quarrel, now lately rais'd; but vehemently urg'd divers times heretofore, by many other Catholicks, many Years agoe; yea, in the very beginning of the late Queen's Reign: As namely, by two Learned Doctors Harding and Stapleton, who mightily pres'd them with the defect of due Vocation and Consecration, urging them to prove the same, and to shew how, and by whom they were made Priests and Bishops: Thus he.

And to give you the words of the said Doctors: Thus writes Dr. Harding to Mr. Jewel, pretended Bishop of Salisbury. — “ It remains, Mr. Jewel, you tell us, Whether your Vocation be Ordinary or Extraordinary: If it be Ordinary, shew us the Letters of your Orders: At least, shew us that you have received Power to do the Office you presume to Exercise, by due order of Laying on of Hands and Consecration: But Order and Consecration you have none: For who could give that to you of all these New Ministers, (howsoever else you call them) which he has not himself? These are his very words to Mr. Jewel; having but a little before urg'd him, also in the words of Tertullian, thus: — “ You know what Tertullian says of such as you be, Edant origines Ecclesiarum suarum; We say likewise to you, Mr. Jewel; and that we say to you, we say to each one of your Companions: Tell us the Original, and first spring of your Church; shew us the Register of your Bishops continually succeeding one another from the beginning; so as that the first Bishop have some one of the Apostles, or of the Apostolical Men, for his Author and Predecessor, &c. Therefore (says he) to go from your Succession, which you cannot prove, and to come to your Vocation; How say you, Sir? You bear your self, as tho' you were Bishop of Salisbury: But how can you prove your Vocation? By what Authority Usurp you the Administration of Doctrine and Sacraments? What can you alledge for the Right and Proof of your Ministry? Who has call'd you? Who has laid Hands on you? By what Example has he done it? How, and by whom are you Consecrated? Who has sent you? Who has committed to you the Office you take upon you? &c. In this manner was Mr. Jewel urg'd: To all which he never reply'd, by sending Dr. Harding to any Register of his, or his Metropolitan's Consecration: Or by telling him, that their Consecration at Lambeth, was upon Record: Or that they had Authentick Testimonies to shew who Impos'd Hands upon them. And how easily had such Answers been given to these hard Questions, if there had then been extant any Authentick Register or Records of his Own, or Matthew Parker's Consecration at Lambeth?

After the same manner he is set upon by Dr. Stapleton, in his Answer to Mr. Jewel's Book, Entituled, A Reply, &c. — “ How chanc'd then, Mr. Jewel, (says he) That you and your Fellows, bearing your selves for Bishops, have not so much as this congruity and consent; I will not say of the Pope, but of any Christian Bishops at all, throughout all Christendome; neither are lik'd and allow'd of any one of them all; but have taken upon you that Office, WITHOUT ANY IMPOSITION OF HANDS; without all Ecclesiastical Authority, without all Order of Canons and Right? I ask not, Who gave you Bishopricks, but, WHO MADE YOU BISHOPS? So he to Jewel.

And thus again, in his Counter-blast against Horn, pretended Bishop of Winchester. — “ Is it not Notorious (says he to Horn,) That you and your Colleagues, [Parker, &c.] were not Ordained according to the Prescript, I will not say of the Church, but even of the very Statutes? How then can you challenge to your self the Name of the Lord Bishop of Winchester? And in another place he urges Mr. Horn with his Being without any Consecration at all of his Metropolitan, [Parker]; himself poor man, (says he) being no Bishop neither. Who (I say once again)

gain) can imagine, that *Jewel* and *Horn* should have been so careless of their Character and Honour, as not to have produc'd their *Lambeth-Register* and Records, [If any such Authentick Writings had then been extant] when not only their own credit, but even the credit of their Metropolitan, *Parker*, and all the rest of Queen Elizabeth's New Bishops; yea, the whole Succession of that Race, were so miserably Shipwrack'd? Yea, in how great stead would such *Lambeth Writings* have stood Mr. *Horn*, when he durst not joyn Issue with Bishop *Bonner*, upon the Plea, *That he was no Bishop, when he tender'd Bonner the Oath of Supremacy.*

The Case was thus: By the first Session of that Parliament *s. Eliz. 1.* Power was given to any Bishop in the Realm, to tender the Oath of Supremacy (Enacted *1 Eliz.*) to any Ecclesiastical Person within his Diocese; and the Refuser was to incur a Premunire. By Virtue of this Statute, Mr. *Robert Horn*, pretended Bishop of *Winchester*, tenders the Oath unto Doctor *Bonner*, (Bishop of *London*, but depriv'd by Queen *Elizabeth*, and then a Prisoner in the *Marshalsea*, which was within the Diocese of *Winchester*): *Bonner* refuses to take it. *Horn* certifies his Refusal into the *King's-Bench*; whereupon *Bonner* was Indicted upon the Statute. He prays Judgment, Whether he might not give in Evidence upon this Issue, *Quod ipse non est inde culpabilis, eo quod dictus Episcopus de Winchester, non fuit Episcopus tempore oblationis Sacramenti.* "That he was not culpable, because the said *Horn*, call'd Bishop of *Winchester*, was not Bishop when he tender'd him the Oath. And it was resolv'd by all the Judges at *Sergeants-Inn*, in Judge *Cartlin's* (the chief Justices) Chamber, *That if the Verity and matter be so indeed, he should well be received to give in Evidence upon this Issue, and the Jury should try it.* Now, what the Tryal was, appears by that he was not Condemned, nor ever any further troubled for that Case, tho' he was a Man especially aim'd at. And at the next Session of that Parliament (which was *8. Elizabeth*) they were forc'd (for want, you see, of a better Character) to beg they might be declar'd Bishops by Act of Parliament.

Besides, 'tis no more credible, that such knowing and conscientious Men, as Dr. *Stapleton*, Dr. *Harding*, *Constable*, *Kellison*, &c. then living in *England*, and probably at *London*, would Question so publick and solemn an Action; than it is, that a Sober Man should now call in doubt King *JAMES* the Second's Coronation at *Westminster*; or ask in Print, who set the Crown upon his Head, pretending he never had been Crown'd.

But in Answer to these our Objections; Dr. *Bramhall* fally affirms, That the said Records were spoken of in the Eighth Year of Queen *Elizabeth*: For proof of which, he would gladly have the World so grossly to mistake the words of the Statute *8. Eliz.* as to think that the mention there made of the Records of her Majesties Father, and Brothers Time, and also of her own Time, have relation to their *Lambeth-Register*: Whereas by the Records there spoken of, is understood only the Records of Her Father's, Brother's, and her Own *Letters Patents*; and not their (then unknown) *Lambeth-Register*.

But Dr. *Bramhall*, to make good his False Assertion, and to Impose upon the unwary Reader, most egregiously Falsifies the words of the said Statute; saying, *The Statute speaks expressly of the Records of Elections, and Confirmations, and Consecrations: and this he puts down in a different Character, as if they had been the words of the very Statute it self: Whereas, in all the Statute, are not found any such Words as [Records of Elections, and Confirmations, and Consecrations]* But you will find in the said Statute, expressly these words, [As by Her Majesties said Letters Patents, remaining on Record, more plainly will appear.] Which, if attentively consider'd, is sufficient to convince the Reader, that, *The Records of Her Majesty's said Father and Brother's Time, and also of her Own Time, relate not to any Records or Registers of the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury; but only to the Records of the King's and Queen's Letters Patents.* This device of *Bramhall*, is more fully Answer'd and Refuted by the Author of the *Nullity of the Prelatrick Clergy of England*; whither I will refer my Reader.

Again, *Protestants* tell us further, That there is a Register of their Bishops, found in a Book call'd *Parker's Antiquitates Britannica*; which I deny not: But to this I Answer, That the said Register is Forg'd and Foisted into *Parker's Antiq. Britan.* For that Edition, Printed *Anno 1605*, is the first that ever mentioned any such Thing: The old Manuscript of that Book, having no such Register at all in it; As a Learned Author \*, who diligently examin'd the same, affirms in these words, -- *In the Old manuscript of that Book [ Park. Antq. Brit ] which I have seen, and diligently examin'd, there is not any mention or memory at all of any such Register or Consecration of*

See Abridg. of  
Dyer's Report.  
fol. 234.

In this Statute  
is expressly  
mention'd her  
Majesties Fa-  
thers and Bro-  
thers Letters  
Patents: & as  
also, Her own  
remaining on  
Record.

Antiq. Brit  
Edit. Hanov.  
A no 1605.  
\* The Authr  
of a Book  
call'd, The  
Judgment of  
the Apostle  
and first Act.

in points of  
Doctrine, &c  
Printed in the  
Year 1633.  
See Pag. 209,  
211, and 394.

Stat. 1. 8. Eliz.

Mason lib. 3.  
P. 116.

Bram. p. 83:

Pag. 85.

Mat. Parker, or any One of those pretended Protestant Bishops, as the obtruded Register speaks of. And any man reading the Printed Book, will easily see, that 'tis a mere Foisted and Inserted thing; having no Connection, Correspondence, or Affinity, either with that which goes before or follows: And contains more things done after Mat. Parker had written that Book. Yet this very Register mentions not any certain Place or Form of their Consecration: So that it might be perform'd as well at the *Naggs-Head*, as at *Lambeth*. And indeed, we deny them not to have had a certain kind of *Puritanical Consecration*, by *John Scorey*, at the *Naggs-Head* in *Cheapside*: But we deny the said *Naggs-Head Consecration* to be either *Valid* or *Legal*, both for *Defect* in the *Form*, and in the *Minister*; *John Scorey* himself, being no Bishop, no more than *Barlow* and *Coverdale*, as is hinted above, in *Pag. 35*. By reason of which defects, the Queen, it seems, was forc'd, afterwards to declare, or make them Bishops by *Act of Parliament*. But to pass by these things, and to come to a closer Examination of their *Lambeth Records*:

Mr. *Mason*, the very first Man that ever told us of this *Lambeth-Register*, urges it in this manner, — “ Queen *Mary* Died in the Year 1558. the 17th. of November; the same day Died “ Cardinal *Pole*, Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*; and the very same day was Queen *Elizabeth* Pro- “ claim'd. The 15th. of January next following, was the day of Queen *Elizabeth's* Coronation, “ when Dr. *Oglethrop*, Bishop of *Carlisle*, was so Happy as to set the Diadem of that Kingdom “ upon her Royal Head. Now the See of *Canterbury* continued void, till December following; “ about which time the Dean and Chapter having received the *Congè D' Eslire*, Elected “ Master Dr. *Parker* for their Arch-Bishop, *Juxta morem Antiquum & Laudabilem Consuetudinem Ecclesie predictae ab antiquo Usitatam & inconcuso observatam*, Proceeding in this Election “ according to the Ancient manner, and the Laudable custom of the aforesaid Church; *citing* “ for these words, his *New found Register*, [ *Ex Regist. Mat. Parker.* ] After which Election, “ orderly perform'd, and signify'd according to the Law, it pleased Her Highnes to send Her “ Letters Patents of Commission, for his Confirmation and Consecration to Seven Bishops: “ whose Names, with as much of the Commission as is necessary, he sets down; after which he tells us, “ That “ to take away all scruple, he will Faithfully deliver out of Authentical Records, (as he calls them, putting in the Margent, *Ex Regist. M. Parker*, with as much confidence, as if they had been made known to the World, and Publish'd or produc'd upon all Occasions, for Fifty Years together, before ever he spoke of them) “ both the Day when he [ *Mr. Parker* ] was Consecrated, and by Whom, *viz.*

Anno 1559. Mat. Park Cant. Conf. 17. Decemb. By

{ *William Barlow.*  
*John Scorey.*  
*Miles Coverdale.*  
*John Hodgskins.*

These are Mr. *Mason's* Obtruded Records; with which let us compare the Words of another Recorder [ *Dr. Bramhall*, ] who after having told us of *Mat. Parker's* being, by *Congè D' Eslire*, Elected Arch Bishop of *Canterbury*, says, “ The Queen, accepting this Election, was graciously “ pleased to Issue out *TWO* Commissions for the Legal *Confirmation* of the said Election, and “ *Consecrating* of the said Arch-Bishop: The former dated the 9th. of *Septemb.* Anno 1559. di- “ rected to Six Bishops; *Cuthbert*, Bishop of *Durham*; *Gilbert*, Bishop of *Baib*; *David*, Bishop of *Peterborough*; *Anthony*, Bishop of *Landiff*; *William Barlow*, Bishop; and *John Scorey*, Bishop. Which Commission he sets down at large, from *Ro. par. 2. 1. Eliz.* Dated, *Apud Redgrave, No- no Die Septembris Anno Regni Elizabethæ Angliae, &c primo.*

*Per breve de privato Sigillo*

Examinatur Ri. BROUGHTON.

Then he goes on, — “ Now if any Man desire a Reason why this first Commission was “ not Executed, the best Account I can give him is this, That it was directed to Six Bishops, “ without an [ *Aut minus, Or at the least Four of you;* ] so as if any one of the Six were Sick or *Absent*

" Absent, or Refus'd, the rest could not proceed to *Confirm* or *Consecrate*. And that some of them did refuse, I am very apt to believe, because Three of them, not long after, were Depriv'd: Thus Dr. Bramhall.

The Three Bishops, he means, that were (as he would have us believe) *Shortly after Depriv'd*, were *Cuthbert Tunstal*, Bishop of *Durham*; *Gilbert Bourne*, Bishop of *Bath*; and *David Pole*, Bishop of *Peterborough*. But according to *John Stow*, and *Holinshad*, these Three Bishops, with other Ten or Eleven, all Catholicks, were Depriv'd and Depos'd from their Sees, in *July* before, for refusing the Oath of Supremacy. " In the Month of *July*, (says *Stow*) the Old Bishops of *England*, then living, were call'd and examined by certain of the Queens Majesty's Council, where the Bishops of *York*, *Fly*, and *London*, with others, to the Number of Thirteen or Fourteen, for refusing to take the Oath, touching the Queen's Supremacy, and other Articles, were depriv'd from their Bishopricks. *Holinshad* has also the same words, and tells us further, who Succeeded in their rooms and places.

*Holinshad*, in the Praises of Bishop *Tunstal* of *Durham*, has these words: " He was, by the Noble Queen *Elizabeth*, depriv'd of his Bishoprick, &c. and was committed to *Matthew Parker*, Bishop of *Canterbury*, who us'd him very Honourably, both for the Gravity, Learning, and Age of the said *Tunstal*: But he, not long remaining under the Ward of the said Bishop, did shortly after, the 18th. of *November*, in the Year 1559. depart this Life at *Lambeth*, where he first receiv'd his Consecration. [By this it appears, That *Matthew Parker* was Bishop of *Canterbury*, and liv'd in the Bishops Palace at *Lambeth*, consequently Install'd in the Bishoprick, which he could not be, before he was *Consecrated* (if *Consecration* was then us'd); and all this before the 18th. of *November*. 1559.]

And well might he, by this time, be in the full Enjoyment and Possession of the Bishoprick of *Canterbury*; for by *Stow* and *Holinshad* we find him call'd *Bishop Elect* on the 9th. of *Sept.* when He and Others assisted at the King of *France's* Obsequies. Yea, by *Holinshad* it evidently appears, That they were *Elected* immediately (or however very shortly) after the Deprivation of the Old *Catholick Bishops*: For, on the 12th. of *August*, we find Dr. *Grindall* not only call'd *Bishop Elect*, but exercising as much Power, as if he had been more than only *Elect*. His words are these: " On the 12th. of *August*, being *Saturday*, the High Altar in *Paul's Church*, with the Rood, and the Images of *Mary* and *John*, standing in the Rood-Loft, were taken down; and this was done by the command of Dr. *Grindall*, newly Elect Bishop of *London*.

The Truth of what I have here set down from *Holinshad* and *Stow*, is unquestionable: But if it agree not with Mr. *Mason*, and Dr. *Bramhall*, and their *Lambeth-Records*, shall we not have just cause to reject these as *Forg'd*? But, before we compare them together, let us first see what consent and agreement is found among the Records and Recorders themselves.

First, In the Queens Letters Patents, or Commission for Consecrating *Mat. Parker*; the Suffragan Bishop, there mentioned, is named *Richard*, Suffragan of *Bedford*; Whereas by Mr. *Mason* and others, he is called *John*: Yea, *Mason* calls him *John* in one place, and *Richard* in another. I suppose those, who made these Records, might be Ignorant of the said Suffragan's Name; and therefore, for making sure work, calls him sometimes *Richard*, sometimes *John*: But if these Records had been made while the Man himself was living, and when he Impos'd Hands on *Mat. Parker*, he could have satisfi'd them of his True Name, and the Place where he was Suffragan, *viz.* Whether of *Bedford* or *Dover*? And whether there was any other Suffragan there besides himself, if we may suppose that the *Lambeth Notarius Publicus* could be Ignorant of such circumstances?

Secondly, Mr. *Sutcliff* affirms, That *Parker* was Consecrated by *Barlow*, *Coverdale*, *Scorey*, and Two Suffragans. But by our pretended Register, we find but One Suffragan at that Solemity.

Thirdly, Mr. *Mason*, and his Records, file him Suffragan of *Bedford*: But by Dr. *Butler* he is call'd Suffragan of *Dover*.

Fourthly, In Mr. *Mason*, we hear tell but of One Commission from the Queen, for the Confirmation and Consecration of *M. Parker*. But *Bramhall*, by more diligent search among the Records, finds Two; the first dated *September* the 9th.

Fifthly, By which Commission it appears, *Parker* was *Elected* before the 9th. of *September*: But Mr. *Mason* says, He was *Elected* about the beginning of *December*.

See *Jo. Stow*  
and *Holinshad*  
in *An. 1. Eliz.*

See *D. Bramh.*  
p. 87, 89, 90.

*Sutcliff* ag.  
Dr. *Kellion*,  
p. 5.  
Butler Ep. d.  
Consecrat.  
Ministr.  
Eiam. p. 83.

Thus they concur one with another: And to compare them with *R. Hollinshead*, and *Jo. Stow's* *Chronicles*, they jump as exactly, as if the One had been Written at *China*, and the Other at *Lambeth*: For,

*Sixtly*, Mr. *Mason*, I say, affirms, That the Dean and Chapter Elected Dr. *M. Parker* about the Month of *December*. But in *Stow* and *Hollinshead*, we find him and others call'd *Bishops Elect*, on the 9th. of *September*. Yea, seeing *Hollinshead* calls *Grindall* Newly Elect on the 12th. of *August*; we may easily conclude, that *Mar. Parker* [the Metropolitan] was also Elected before that Time; which, you see, is about Four Months before *Mason's* Election by *Conge d' Eslire*.

*Seventy*, Mr. *Mason* affirms, That the See of *Canterbury* continu'd void till *December 1559*. On the 17th. of which Month (according to the New Register) *Parker* was Consecrated. But in *Hollinshead* we find, that *Mat. Parker* was Bishop of *Canterbury*, and liv'd in the Bishops Palace at *Lambeth*, where he had Bishop *Tonstal* committed [Prisoner] to his charge, long before the 17th. of *December*: For on the 18th. of *November*, 1559. the said Bishop *Tonstal* Died.

*Eig hly*, Dr. *Bramhall*, (as is said) from our New-made Records, brings us a Commission, dated on the 9th. of *September 1559*. And directed (besides others) to Three Catholick Bishops, [*Cuthbert Tonstal*, *Gilbert Bourne*, and *David Pool*] requiring them to *Confirm* and *Consecrate M. Parker*. And has the confidence to affirm, That the said Three Bishops were shortly after depriv'd from their *Bishopricks*, as he is very apt to believe, for refusing to Obey the said Commission. But in *Stow* and *Hollinshead* we find, That the said Three Catholick Bishops (with Ten or Eleven others) were depriv'd of their *Bishopricks* in the Month of *July* before, for refusing the Oath of Supremacy: And *Mason* himself confirms this, by acknowledging, they were depriv'd not long after the Feast of *St. John Baptist*: For which he also cites *Saunders, lib de Schismate Angl.* But pray consider, Sirs; What can be more Absurd, than to imagine that Queen *Elizabeth* would be behoden to such *Roman Catholick Bishops*, as she had formerly Depriv'd of their *Bishopricks*, and made Prisoners, for the *Confirming* and *Consecrating* of Her New Protestant Bishops, who were to be *unlawfully Intruded* into their Sees; especially she having, as *Bramhall* says, Protestant Bishops e-nough of Her own; or if such had been wanting, might (he says) have easily had store of Bishops out of *Ireland*, to have done the work?

Pray give me leave to demand of our *English* Prelates, Why this first Commission was by the Queen directed to those Three Zealous *Catholick* Bishops, and not rather to her own *Protestant* Bishops, to whom she directed the last Commission (dated *Decemb. 6.*)? Her Majesty was not Ignorant, that their Consciences had been too tender to permit them to swear Her self Head of the *Church of England*: And that rather than Gall their so Tender Consciences, they were content to lose their *Bishopricks*, and suffer perpetual Imprisonment: Could she, upon revolving this in her Princely Thoughts, easily imagine that they would, without all scruple, Impose hands on Her Newly Elect Bishops, whom they knew to be of a Religion as far different from Themselves, as King *Edward the VI.* was from Queen *Mary's*? Could she suppose, that they would make Bishops in that *Church*, whereof themselves refus'd to be Members? Could she think, that those *Catholick* Bishops would Consecrate *Parker*, according to King *Edward the Sixth's* Form of Consecration, which they had in Queen *Mary's* days declared to be *Invalid* and *Null*; and which, at this time, was also *Illegal*? Or could the Queen easily imagin, that *Matthew Parker* (and the rest of Her chosen Bishops, who had stood so much upon their *Punctilio's* at *Frankford*) would receive Consecration by a *Form* condemned as Superstitious and Antichristian; and from which (as *Mason* says) they had par'd away so many Superfluities; yea, so many, as even to pare out the very Name, it self, of *Bishop*? Let the Impartial Reader consider of these things.

How our present pretended Bishops Themselves will make all these things agree, will be hard to imagine: Which, if they cannot do, let them be content to leave us to our own Liberties, and freedom of Thought; and to excuse us, if we freely affirm, That *Matthew Parker* was never Consecrated at *Lambeth*: That the said Records are *Forg'd*: And, That Themselves are but mere *Lay-men*, without Mission, without Succession, without Consecration.

*Nintly*, 'Tis none of the least Objections against *Parker's* Solemn Consecration at *Lambeth*, That we find it not once mentioned by the Historians of those Times, especially by *John Stow*, who profess'd so particular a Kindness and Respect to *Parker*; and who was so Exact in setting down

down all things (of far less moment) done about London. Doubtless, he omitted it not thro' Negligence or Forgetfulness, seeing he's not unmindful to set down the Consecration of Cardinal Pool, Parker's immediate Predecessor, and the very day on which he said his first Mass. Nor does it appear to have been through Forgetfulness, that Hollinshead mentions not this Notorious Lambeth Solemnity, seeing he tells us, That Bishop Tonstal (who Died under Parker's custody) Receiv'd his Consecration at Lambeth: If either he or John Stow had but given us only such a short Hint as this, of Parker's Consecration at Lambeth, we should never have questioned it further; nor have doubted of the Truth of it, tho' they had not been so exact to an Hair in every Punctilio, as to have told us of the Chappel's being Adorned with Tapistry towards the East; A Red Cloth on the Floor [in Advent]; A Sermon, Communion, Concourse of People; Miles Coverdale's Side Woollen Gown: Of the Queens sending to see if all things had been rightly perform'd? [What Care was here taken?] Of Answer being brought her, that there was not a Tittle amiss, only Miles Coverdale was in his Side Woollen Gown, at the very minute of the Consecration: Of their Assuring Her that that could not cause any Defect in the Consecration, &c. as our Records mention; which ridiculous circumstances render them not a whit the more credible.

If now, from what has been said, these Lambeth Records appear evidently to be Forg'd, to what other Refuge will these pretenders to Episcopacy have Recourse for their Episcopal Character, but to Queen Elizabeth's Letters Patents, and an Act of Parliament? If so, I see no great reason why they should find Fault with their Ancient Name and Title of Parliamentary Bishops. Who ever read of Bishops, between St. Peter's Time and Parker's, that stood in need of an Act of Parliament to declare them such? Doubtless, if they had been Consecrated at Lambeth by Imposition of the Hands of true Bishops, (tho' All their Consecrators had been in Side Woollen Gowns, and neither Tapistry towards the East, nor Red Cloth on the Floor of the Chappel) and could have shewn Authentick Records of the same, they would never have desir'd the Queen to Make and Declare them Bishops by Act of Parliament: Nor would the Queen, and the Wisdom of the Nation, have consented to the making of such a Superfluous Act, if their Reverences had desir'd it. No! no! there would have been no more need of any such Act for Them then, than there had been for Threescore and Nine preceding Arch-Bishops of Canterbury.

Several ridiculous circumstances mentioned in the Records, which yet render them less credible.

After all this, will arise yet another Quæry; to wit, By what Form of Consecration Matthew Parker was Consecrated? Our present Prelates and Clergy will not say, I suppose, that he was made Bishop according to the Roman Catholick Form, tho' Queen Elizabeth had Reviv'd the Act of 25. Hen. 8. 20. which Authoriz'd the same. Nor can they say, that King Edward the VI. Form was then in being, in the Eye of the Law: For that part of the Act of Edw. VI. which establish'd the Book of Ordination, having been Repeal'd by Queen Mary, was not Reviv'd till Six Years after the pretended Consecration of Matthew Parker, viz. till 8 of Eliz. as is easily prov'd. For whereas the Act of 5 and 6. Edw. 6. 1. consisted of two parts; One, which Authoriz'd the Book of Common-Prayer, as it was then newly explain'd and perfected: Another, which establish'd the Form of Consecrating Bishops, &c. and added to the Book of Common-Prayer. This Act, as to both these parts, was Repeal'd in Queen Mary: and this Repeal was Revers'd in Eliz. 1. as to that part which concern'd the Book of Common-Prayer Only: For so runs the Act, [The said Statute of Repeal, and every thing therein contained, ONLY, concerning the said Book (viz. of Common-Prayer, Authoriz'd by Edw. 6.) shall be void, and of none effect]. And afterwards, 8 Eliz. 1. was reviv'd that other part of it, which concern'd the Form of Ordination, viz. in these words, [Such Order and Form for the Consecrating of Arch-Bishops, Bishops, &c. as was set forth in the Time of Edw. 6. and added to the said Book of Common-Prayer, and Authoriz'd 5 and 6 Edw. 6. shall stand, and be in full force; and shall from henceforth be Used and Observed]. By which is as clear as the Sun at Noon-day, that Edward the Sixth's Form was not restored at all by 1 Eliz. either Expressly or in General Terms, under the Name and Notion of the Book of Common-Prayer, as Protestants would have it thought. Nay, rather it was Formally Excluded by the said Act, 1 Eliz. For that Act of Edward VI. consisting of nothing else but the Authorizing of the Book of Common-Prayer, and Establishing, and adding to it the Book of Ordination: And the Act of Queen Mary having Repeal'd that whole Act, as to both these parts; that Act of 1 Eliz. Reversing that Repeal, as to the Book of Common-Prayer ONLY, did plainly and directly Exclude the Repealing of it, as to the Book of Ordination; there being

nothing else to be Excluded, by that word *ONLY*, but that Book. So that it is undeniably evident, That King *Edward VI.* Form of Consecration was at that day *Illegal*. And must we imagine, that the Queen would suffer her New Bishops to be Consecrated by an *Illegal Form*, when she could as easily have Authoriz'd it by the Law, as she had done the *Roman Form*, by Reviving the *Act 25 Hen. 8. 20*? Yea, it had been as easie to make that *Form Legal*, as it was afterwards to declare them Bishops by *Act of Parliament*; and doubtless, more commendable.

But admit *Matthew Parker*, and the rest of Queen *Elizabeth's* New Bishops, were made such by this (then *Illegal*) *Form*; yet, if this *Form* prove *INVALID*, they are but still where they were before their Election, as to their Character. And that it is *Invalid*, is sufficiently and clearly prov'd by the Learned Author of *Erasmus Senior*, to whom I will refer my Reader. *Yea, the Protestant Bishops and Clergy Themselves, have judg'd the said Form to be Invalid*; and therefore thought necessary to repair the Essential Defects of the same, by adding the words *Bishop* and *Priest*: (Essential Defects, I call the want of these two words, *Bishop* and *Priest*; for if they had not been Essential, why were they added?) Yet this will not serve their turn; for before they can have a true Clergy, they must change the Character of the *Ordainers*, as well as the Form of *Ordination*. A *Valid Form* of *Ordination*, pronounce'd by a Minister, not *Validly Ordain'd*, gives no more Character, than if it had continu'd still *Invalid*, and never been alter'd. The present *Protestant Bishops*, who chang'd the Form of their own Consecration upon their Adversaries Objections of the *Invalidity* thereof (for immediatly after *Erasmus Senior* was published against it, they alter'd it, *viz. Anno 1662.*) might as well submit to be *Ordain'd* by *Catholick Bishops*; or else, with the *Presbyterians*, utterly deny an *Episcopal Character*, as allow (by altering the *Form* after so long time and dispute) that it was not sufficient to make themselves, and their Predecessors, *Priests* and *Bishops*.

What has hitherto been said, concerning the Nullity of their Character, is yet further confirm'd, by their altering of the 25. of their 39 Articles: For these first Bishops, *Parker, Horn, Jewel, Grindal, &c.* understanding in what condition they were in, for want of Consecration by *Imposition of Hands*, resolv'd, in their Convocation, *Anno 1562.* to publish the 39 Articles, made by *Cranmer* and his Associates, but with some Alteration and Addition; especially to that Article wherein they speak of the *Sacraments*: For,

Whereas *Cranmer's* 25 or 26 Article says nothing of *Holy Orders* by *Imposition of Hands*, or any *Visible Sign* or *Ceremony* requir'd therein; *Parker*, and his Bishops, having taken upon themselves that Calling, without any such *Ceremony* of *Imposition of Episcopal Hands*, (for I believe they set not much by *John Scorey's Hands and Bible in the Naggs-Head*); declar'd, That *God ordain'd not any Visible Sign or Ceremony for the Five Last, commonly called Sacraments*; whereof *Holy Orders* is One. This alteration and addition, you may see in Dr. *Heylins* Appendix to *Ecclesia Restaurata*, pag. 189 — In this Convocation, they deny'd also *Holy Order* to be a *Sacrament*; consequently, not likely to Impress any Indelible Character in the Soul of the Party *Ordain'd*: which Doctrine continu'd long after among them, as appears by Mr. *Rogers*, in his Defence of the 39 Articles, who affirms, that *None but disorder'd Papists will say that Order is a Sacrament*; and demands, *Where it can be seen (in Holy Scripture) that Orders or Priesthood is a Sacrament? What Form has it (says he)? What Promise? What Institution from CHRIST?* But after they began to pretend to have receiv'd an *Episcopal Character* from *Roman Catholick Bishops*, and to put out their *Lambeth Records* in defence of it, they dislik'd this Doctrine, and Taught the contrary, *viz.* That *Ordination is a Sacrament: We deny not Ordination to be a Sacrament, (says Dr. Bramhall) tho' it be not One of those Two which are generally necessary to Salvation.*

By order of this Convocation was Printed the *Bible of 1562.* where the aforesaid Text [*When they had Ordain'd to them Priests, &c.*] was translated, *When they had Ordain'd Elders by Election*; which, as soon as they began to thirst after the glorious Character of *Priest* and *Bishops*, they Corrected.

And tho' *Cranmer* car'd as little for any *Visible Signs* [*Imposition of Hands*] or *Ceremonies* in *Ordination*, as the other first *Protestant Reformers*, and according to their Practice had abjur'd the *Priestly and Episcopal Character*, which he had receiv'd among *Catholicks*; as may be gather'd by his Words, related by *Fox* in his *Degradation*, thus; “*Then a Barber clipp'd his Hair round about, and the Bishop scraped the tops of his Fingers, where he had been Anointed, &c.* when

Defence of  
the 39 Article.  
pg. 254, 255.

See *Malon*  
and *Dr. Bram.*  
pg. 97.

*Fox's AE. and*  
*Monuments*  
*fol. 2016.*

When they were thus doing; *All this (quoth the Arch-Bishop) needed not, I had my self done with this gear long agoe.* And also by his Doctrine; that, *In the New-Testament, he that is appointed to be a Priest or Bishop, needs no Consecration by the Scripture; for Election thereunto is sufficient.* Tho', I say, *Cranmer* val'd not any Episcopal Consecration, which he had receiv'd in the Catholick Church; yet he presum'd not to make the denial thereof an Article of the Protestant Faith: But Queen Elizabeth's pretended Bishops, and English Church, in their Convocation 1562, seeing, they knew they had no Episcopal Character by Imposition of true Bishops Hands; thought fit to make it a part of the Protestant Belief, *That no such visible Sign or Ceremony was Necessary, or Instituted by CHRIST;* and therefore concluded *Holy Orders* not to be a *Sacrament.* And tho', I say, the *Church of England* now Teach and Practise the contrary, and in King James the First's Reign put out of the Text the word *ELECTION*, as an Imposture, or Gross Corruption; yet this change of the *Matter* does no more make them now true Priests and Bishops, than their last Change of their *Form* of Ordination, in the Year 1662, soon after the Happy Restauration of King Charles the Second.

*Ecclesia non est, quæ Sacerdotem non habet. S. Hierom.*

'Tis enough, that in this place we have prov'd these Men without *Consecration* or *Ordination*; yet seeing they Glory also in Assuming to themselves the Name of *PASTORS*, [*Pastor of St. Martins, &c.*] it may not be unseasonable to propose a few Quæries, touching their Pastoral Jurisdiction.

I. Whether it is not a Power of the Keys, to Institute a *Pastor* over a Flock of Clergy and People?

II. Whether any but a *Pastor* can give Pastoral Jurisdiction?

III. Whether any Bishop, but the Bishop of the Diocese (or Commissioned from him, or his Superior) can Validly Institute a *Pastor*, to any Parochial Church, within such a Diocese?

IV. Whether any number of Bishops can Validly confirm or give Pastoral Jurisdiction to the Bishop of any Diocese, if the Metropolitan (or some Authoriz'd by him, or his Superior) be not One?

V. Or to the Metropolitan of a Province, if the Primate of the Nation (or some Authoriz'd by him, or his Superior) be not One?

VI. Whether any but the *Chief Patriarch* of that part of the World, (or Authoriz'd by him) can Validly give Pastoral Jurisdiction to the Primate of a Nation?

VII. Whether the Bishop of *Rome* is not *Chief Patriarch* of the *Western Church*, consequently of this Nation?

VIII. Whether *Mar. Parker*, the first Protestant pretended Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, receiv'd his Pastoral Jurisdiction from the Bishop of *Rome*, or from others by him Authoriz'd? Or,

IX. Whether those who made *Mar. Parker* Primate of *England*, or Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, had any Jurisdiction to that Act, but what they receiv'd from Queen *Elizabeth*?

X. Whether Queen *Elizabeth* had the Power of the Keys, either of *Order* or *Jurisdiction*?

XI. Whether it is not an Essential part of the *Catholick Church* to have *Pastors*?

XII. Whether Salvation can be had in a *Church* wanting *Pastors*?

XIII. Whether they do not commit a most Heinous Sacrilege, who having neither valid *Ordination*, nor Pastoral Jurisdiction, do notwithstanding take upon them to Administer *Sacraments*, and exercise all other Acts of Episcopal and Priestly Functions?

XIV. Whether the People are not also Involv'd with them, in the same Sin, so often as they Communicate with them *In*, or co-operate *To*, those Sacrilegious Presumptions?

XV. Whether those, who assume to themselves the Names and Offices of *Bishops* and *Priests*, take upon them to *Teach*, *Preach*, *Administer Sacraments*, and perform all other *Episcopal* and *Priestly Functions*, without *Vocation*, without *Ordination*, without *Consecration*, without *Succession*, without *Mission*, or without *Pastoral Jurisdiction*, are not the very Men, of whom our Blessed Saviour charg'd us to beware?

XVI. To conclude, Whether 'tis Wisdom in the People of *England*, to Hire such Men at the charge of perhaps above 1000000 *per Annum*, to lead them the broad way to Perdition?

## Another Corrupt Addition against the perpetual Sacrifice of CHRIST's Body and Blood.

**P**ROTESTANTS Teach, in the 31 of their 39 Articles, *That the Offering of CHRIST Once made, is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation and Satisfaction for all the Sins of the whole World, &c. Wherefore the Sacrifice of Masses, in which it was commonly said, That the Priests did Offer CHRIST for the Quick and the Dead, to have Remission of Pain and Guilt, were blasphemous Fables, and dangerous Deceits:* By this Doctrine the Church of England bereaves Christians of the most Inestimable Jewel, and Richest Treasure, that ever CHRIST our Saviour left to his Church; to wit, The most Holy and Venerable Sacrifice of His Sacred Body and Blood in the MASS, which is daily Offered to GOD the Father, for a Propitiation for our Sins. And because they would have this False and Erroneous Doctrine of theirs back'd by Sacred Scripture, They most egregiously corrupt the Text, *Heb. 10. ver. 10.* by adding to the same Two Words not found in the Greek or Latin Copies, [viz. *For All;*] The Apostles words being, — *In the which Will we are Sanctified by the Oblation of the Body of Jesus CHRIST once:* Which they corruptly read, in their last Translation, — *By the which Will we are Sanctified, through the Offering of the Body of Jesus CHRIST Once [FOR ALL.]* By which Addition, they endeavour to take away the DAILY Oblation of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass: Contradicting the Doctrine of GOD's Holy Church, which Believes and Teaches, “That our Lord God, although he was once to Offer himself to GOD the Father upon the Altar of the Cross by Death, that he might there work Eternal Redemption: Yet because his Priesthood was not to be extinguished by Death, In the last Supper, which Night he was to be Betrayed, that he might leave a Visible Sacrifice to his Beloved Spouse the Church, whereby that Bloody One, once to be performed upon the Cross, should be represented, and the Memory thereof should remain to the End of the World, and the wholesome Virtue thereof should be applyed for the Remission of those Sins which we daily commit, declaring himself to be Ordained a Priest for ever, according to the Order of Melchizedek, He Offered to GOD the Father his Body and Blood, under the Forms of Bread and Wine; and under the Signs of the same Things he gave it to the Apostles, whom then he Ordain'd Priests of the New-Testament, that they should Receive it; and by these words he commanded Them, and their Successors in Priesthood, That they should Offer it, *Do ye this in Commemoration of me, &c.* And, “Because in this Divine Sacrifice, which is perform'd in the Mass, the self-same CHRIST is contain'd, and unbloodily Offered, who Offer'd himself once Bloodily upon the Altar of the Cross: The Holy Synod Teaches this Sacrifice to be truly Propitiatory, &c. Wherefore, according to the Tradition of the Apostles, it is duly Offer'd, not only for the Sins, Punishments, Satisfactions, and other Necessities of the Faithful that are Living, but also such as are Dead in CHRIST, as yet not fully Purged. This is the Catholick Doctrine, deliver'd in the Sacred Council of Trent, which the Church of England calls Blasphemy, Fables, and Dangerous Deceits; and against which they Falsifie the Sacred Text of Scripture, by thrusting into it Words of their own, which they find not in any of the Greek or Latin Copies.

But lest they may Object, That this is but a New Doctrine, not Taught in the Primitive Church, nor deliver'd down to us, from the Apostles by Apostolical Tradition: I will give you these following Testimonies from the Fathers of the first Five Hundred Years.

St. Cyprian says, “CHRIST is Priest for ever, according to the Order of Melchizedek, which Order is this, coming from this Sacrifice, and thence descending, That Melchizedek was Priest of GOD most high, That he Offer'd Bread and Wine, That he Blessed Abraham; for who is more a Priest of GOD most high, than our Lord Jesus CHRIST, who Offer'd Sacrifice to GOD the Father, and Offer'd the same that Melchizedek had Offer'd, Bread and Wine, viz. his BODY and BLOOD?

And a little after: “That therefore in *Genesis* the Blessing might be rightly Celebrated about Abraham by Melchizedek the Priest, the Image (or Figure) of CHRIST's Sacrifice, consisting in Bread and Wine, went before; which thing our Lord perfecting and performing, Offer'd

*Concil. Trid.  
Sess. 22. cap. 1  
Cap. 2.*

*Ep. 63. ad  
Cecilium.*

" Offer'd Bread, and the *Chalice* mixt with Wine ; and He, that is the Plenitude, fulfill'd the " Verity of the prefigured Image.

The same Holy Father, in another place, as cited also by the *Magdeburgian Centurists*, in this manner ; " Our Lord Jesus *CHRIST*, says *Cyprian*, *Lib. 2. Ep. 3.* is the High Priest of *GOD* " the Father ; And first Offer'd Sacrifice to *GOD* the Father, and commanded the same to " be done in Remembrance of him : And that Priest truly Executes *CHRIST*'s place, who " imitates that which *CHRIST* did ; and then he Offers in the *Church* a True and Full Sa- " crifice to *GOD*. This Saying so displeases the Centurists, that they say, " *Cyprian* affirms " Superstitiously, That the Priest Executes *CHRIST*'s place in the Supper of our Lord.

*St. Hierom.* " Have recourse, says he, to the Book of *Genesis*, and you shall find *Melchizedek*, " King of *Salem*, Prince of this City ; who even there, in Figure of *CHRIST*, Offer'd Bread " and Wine, and Dedicated the Christian Mystery in our Saviours Body and Blood. Again, " *Mel- chizedek* Offer'd not Bloody Victims, but Dedicated the Sacrament of *CHRIST* in Bread " and Wine, a simple and pure Sacrifice. And yet more plainly in another place, " Our Mini- " stery, says he, is signify'd in the Word of Order, not by *Aaron*, in Immolating Brute Victims, " but in Offering Bread and Wine, that is, the Body and Blood of our Lord *JESUS*.

*St. Augustin* expressly Teaches, That " *Melchizedek*, bringing forth the Sacrament (or Mystery) " of our Lord's Table, knew how to Figure his Eternal Priesthood. — " There first appear'd (says he in another place) that Sacrifice, which is now Offer'd to *GOD* by Christians, in the " whole World.

Again, (*Conc. 1. in Psal. 35.*) " There was formerly, says he, as you have known, the Sacrifice " of the *Jews*, according to the Order of *Aaron*, in the Sacrifices of Beasts, and this in Mystery : " For as yet was the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of our Lord, which the Faithful know, " and such as have read the Gospel : Which Sacrifice now is spread over the whole World. " Set therefore before your Eyes Two Sacrifices, That, according to the Order of *Aaron* ; and " This, according to the Order of *Melchizedek* : For it is written, Our Lord has Sworn, and it " shall not repent him, Thou art a Priest for ever, according to the Order of *Melchizedek*. And in *Conc. 2. Psal. 33.* He expressly teaches, " That *CHRIST*, of his Body and Blood, Insti- " tuted a Sacrifice, according to the Order of *Melchizedek*.

Nothing can be more plain than these words of *St. Irenaeus*, in which he affirms of *CHRIST*, that, " Giving Counsel also to his Disciples, to Offer the first Fruits of his Creatures to *GOD* ; " not as it were needing it, but that they might neither be Unfruitful nor Ungrateful, he " himself took of the Creature of Bread, and gave Thanks, saying, *This is my Body* ; and " likewise the Chalice, he confessed to be his Blood, which is made of that Creature which is " in use amongst us, and Taught a New Oblation of the *New Testament*, which Oblation the " *Church* receiving from the Apostles, throughout the whole World, Offers to *GOD*, to Him, who " gives us Nourishment, the first Fruits of his Gifts in the *New-Testament* ; of whom, amongst " the Twelve Prophets, *Malachy* has thus foretold : I have no will in you, [the *Jews*] says our " Omnipotent Lord, and I will take no Sacrifices at your hands, because, from the rising of " the Sun, to the setting thereof, my Name is Glorify'd among the *Gentiles* ; and in every place, " Incense is Offer'd to my Name, and *A PURE SACRIFICE*, because my Name is great " among the *Gentiles*, saith our Lord Almighty, manifestly signifying by these things, because " the former People indeed ceas'd to Offer to *GOD* ; but in every place a Sacrifice is Offer'd " to *GOD*, and this *PURE*, for his Name is Glorify'd among the *Gentiles*. Thus *St. Irenaeus*, whose Words so touch the *Protestant Centurists*, that they say, " *Irenaeus*, &c. seems to speak " very Incommodiously, when he says, He [*CHRIST*] taught the New Oblation of the *New- Testament*, which the *Church* receiving from the Apostles, Offer'd to *GOD* over all the " World.

*Eusebius Cesariensis.* " We Sacrifice, therefore, to our highest Lord a Sacrifice of Praise : We " Sacrifice to *GOD* a Full, Odoriferous, and most Holy Sacrifice : We sacrifice after a New manner, according to the *New-Testament*, *A PURE HOST*.

*St. Jo. Chrysostome* expounding the Words of the Prophet *Malachy*, says, " The Church which " every where carries about *CHRIST* in it, is Prohibited from no place ; but in every place " there are Altars, in every place Doctrine ; these things *GOD* foretold by his Prophet, for " both declaring the *Churches* Sincerity, and the Ingratitude of the other People [the *Jews*] ;

In the *Alpha. Table* of the 3. *Cens.* under the Letter *S.* *Col. 83.*

*Ep. ad Mar- cel. ut migrat. Be- thleem.*  
*Ep. ad Evag.*  
*Quaest. in Gen. c. 14.*

*Ep. 95.*

*Lib. 16. de Civ. Dei c. 22.*  
See bim also  
*lib. 17. c. 17.*  
*¶ lib. 18. c. 35. cum Psal.*  
*109. lib. 1.*  
*contr. Advers.*  
*Leg. & Pro- phet. c. 20.*  
*Sermo. 4. de Sanctis In- nocentibus.*

*Lib. 4. Advers.*  
*Haec. c. 31.*

*Lib. 1. de- monstrat. E- tang. c. 10.*

*Ad Psal. 95.*

he tells them, I have no pleasure in you, &c. Mark, how clearly and plainly he Interprets the Mystical Table, which is the *UNBLOODY HOST*, and the pure Perfume he calls Holy Prayers, which are Offer'd after the Host. Thou sees how'tis granted, that that Angelical Sacrifice should every where be known; thou seest it is circumscrib'd with no Limits, neither the Altars, nor the Song. In every place Incense is Offer'd to my Name; therefore the Mystical Table, the *HEAVENLY* and exceeding *VENERABLE SACRIFICE*, is indeed the prime *PURE HOST*.

(a) *St. Aug. de Civit. Dei lib. 10. c. 19.*  
 (b) *St. Cypr. l. 2. Ep. 3.*  
 (c) *St. Aug. cit. c. 10.*  
 (d) *Aug. cit. c. 16. & Conc. Tolei. 1. can. 5. Origen. in Num. Hom. 23.*  
 (e) *S. Cyprian l. 2. Ep. 3.*  
 (f) *Aug. lib. 16. c. 22. de Civit. Dei.*  
 (g) *Et lib. 22. c. 8. & lib. 20. contr. Faustum c. 18. & S. Hieron. li. 3. contr. Pelag. Aug. in Plat. 33. can. 2. 7b.*  
 (h) *S. S. Chrys. lib. 1 Cor. Hom. 24.*  
 (i) *S. Aug. in Exhortation c. 110. & de Urs pro mortuis. c. 18.*  
 (j) *Et de Civi. Dei. l. 10. c. 10.*  
 (k) *Et degrad. Novi Test. c. 18. & S. Irenaeus li. 4. c. 32.*  
 (l) *Aug. de Civit. Dei li. 17. c. 20. S. Clement. in Apol. Confut. Edit. 1564. Anverpiae. li. 6. c. 22. fol. 123.*

\* The Author of the Second Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, Sc. p. 13.

Is it not a thing to be admir'd, That the *Church of England* should not only Corrupt the Sacred Scripture against the Great and most *Dreadful Sacrifice*; but also make it an *Article* of her *Faith*, that it is a *blasphemous Fable*, and *dangerous Deceit*? When, without all doubt, she cannot be Ignorant, that the Holy Fathers call it (a) *A visible Sacrifice*. (b) *The True Sacrifice*. (c) *The daily Sacrifice*. (d) *The Sacrifice according to the Order of Melchizedek*. (e) *The Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of CHRIST*. (f) *The Sacrifice of the Altar*. (g) *The Sacrifice of the Church*. (h) *The Sacrifice of the New-Testament*, (i) *which succeeded to all Sacrifices of the Old Testament*. And that it was Offer'd for the Health of the Emperor, *Sacrificamus pro salute Imperatoris*, says *Terullian, de Scapul. c. 2.* That it was Offer'd for the Sick, *Pro Infermis etiam Sacrificamus*, says *St. Chrysostome, Hom. 27. in Act. Apol. For those upon the Sea, and for the Fruits of the Earth*. *Idem*. And for the Purging of Houses Infected with Wicked Spirits *St. Aug. de Civit. Dei, lib. 22. c. 8.* says, That *One went and Offer'd* (in the House Infected) *the Sacrifice of CHRIST's Body*, praying that the *Vexation might cease*; and by *GOD's Mercy* it ceas'd immediately.

In the first Council of Nice, *Can. 14.* we find these words, ' The Holy Council has been Inform'd, That in some Places and Cities the Deacons distribute the Sacrament to Priests: Neither Rule nor Custom has deliver'd, that they who have not Power to Offer Sacrifice, should distribute the Body of *CHRIST* to them who Offer. — See also, *Concil. 3. Bracarense. Can. 3. & Concil. 12. Toler. Can. 5.* Moreover, that *this Holy Sacrifice* (as *GOD's Church*, at this day, Teaches and Practises) *was Offer'd for the Sins of the Living and Dead*, is a Truth so undeniably, That *Craftoius*, a Learned Protestant, in his Book of the *Mass*, against *Bellarmino* (Pag. 167.) reprehends *Origen*, *St. Athanasius*, *St. Ambrose*, *St. Chrysostome*, *St. Augustin*, *St. Gregory the Great*, and *Venerable Bede*, for maintaining *The Mass to be a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of the Living, and of the Dead*. Consider then, what Truth there is in the words of that Author\*; who affirms, That in *Gregory the Great's Time*, *Masses for the Dead were not intended to deliver Souls from those Torments of Purgatory*. Doubtless he consider'd not the words of *St. Augustin, lib. 9. Confess. c. 12. and De Verb. Apost. Serm. 34. viz. That the Sacrifice of our Price was Offer'd for his Mother Monica, being Dead*. And, *That the Universal Church does observe, as deliver'd from their Forefathers, to Pray for the Faithful Deceased in the Sacrifice, and also to Offer the Sacrifice for them*. Nor consider'd this great Vindicator, that great Miracle related by *St. Gregory the Great* himself, concerning *Purgatory*, and the Benefit Souls there receive, by the Offering up of this *Propitiatory Sacrifice*. In his Fourth Book of Dialogues, *cap. 55.* telling us of a Monk call'd *Justus*, who was Obsequious to him, and watch'd with him in his daily Sickness: ' *This Man (says he) being Dead, I appointed the Healthful Host to be Offer'd for his Absolution Thirty Days together*; which done, the said *Justus* appear'd to his Brother by Vision, and said, *I have been hitherto Evil, but now am Well, &c.* And the Brethren in the Monastery counting the Days, found that to be the day on which the 30th. Oblation was Offer'd for him.

Nor would doubtless this *Vindicator* have told us, That *Transubstantiation was yet unborn*, (to wit, in *Gregory the Great's Time*) unless he had a mind to Impose upon his *Reader*, if he had ever read the *Doctrine* of those Fathers, who liv'd before *St. Gregory's Time*: For Example,

*St. Ignatius Martyr*, in his Epistle to the People of *Smyrna*, speaking of the *Hereticks* of his Time (Men of the same Judgment with this *Vindicator*) writes thus: ' *They allow not of Eucharists and Oblations, (says he) because they do not believe the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus CHRIST, which Suffer'd for our Sins, and which the Father, in his Mercy, rais'd again from the Dead*.

*St. Justin Martyr*, in his *Apology* to the Emperor *Antonius Pius*, made for the Christians: ' *Now this Food, (says he, among us, is call'd the Eucharist, which it is lawful for none to partake of, but those who believe our Doctrine to be True, who have been wash'd in the Laver of Regeneration for the Remission of Sins; and who regulate their Lives according to the Prescription*

scription of *Christ*: For we do not receive this as common *Bread*, or common *Drink*: but, as by the Word of *God*, *Jesus Christ*, our Redeemer, being made Flesh, had both *Flesh* and *Blood* for the sake of our Salvation. Just so are we taught, that that Food, over which Thanks are given by Prayers, in his own Words, and whereby our *Blood* and *Flesh* are by a change nourish'd, is the *Flesh* and *Blood* of the Incarnate *JESUS*: For the Apostles, in the Commentaries written by them, call'd the *Gospels*, have Recorded that *JESUS* so commanded them.

St. *Irenaeus*, taking an Argument from the Participation of the *Eucharist*, proves the Resurrection of the *Flesh* against the Hereticks of his Time. 'As the Blessed Apostles say, *Because we are Members of his Body, of his Flesh, and of his Bones*; Not speaking this of any Spiritual or Invisible Man, but of that Disposition which belongs to a Real Man, that consists of *Flesh, Nerves, and Bones*; and is nourish'd by the Chalice, which is his [*Christ's*] *Blood*, and receives encrease by that Bread which is his Body: And as the *Vine*, being Planted in the Earth, brings forth *Fruit* in *Season*: And a *Grain* of *Wheat* falling upon the *Ground*, and *rotting*, rises up with *Encrease* by the *Virtue* of *GOD*, who comprehends all things, which afterwards, by a *Prudent* management, becomes *Servicable* to *Men*; and receiving the *Word of God*, are made the *Eucharist*, which is the *Body* and *Blood* of *CHRIST*; So also our *Bodies* being Nourish'd by it, and laid in the Earth, and there dissolv'd, will arise at their Time; the *Word of God* working in them this Resurrection, to the Glory of *God* the Father.

Lib. 5. c. 11.

*Eusebius Cesariensis*. — 'Making a daily Commemoration of *Him*, [*CHRIST*] and daily Celebrating the Memory of his *Body* and *Blood*; and being now prefer'd to a more excellent Sacrifice and Office than that was of the Old Law, we think it unreasonable, any more to fall back to those first and weak Elements, which contain'd certain Signs and Figures, but not the Truth it self. Another place of *Eusebius* as quoted by St. *John of Damascene*, 'Many Sinners, says he, being Priests, do Offer Sacrifice, neither does *God* deny his Assistance, but by the Holy Ghost Consecrates the propos'd Gifts: And the *Bread* indeed is made the precious *BODY* of our *Lord*, and the *Cup* His precious *BLOOD*.

Lib. 1. de-monstrat E-vang. c. 10.

St. *Hilary*. 'We must not speak, says he, of the things of *GOD*, like *Men*, or in the sense of the *World*: Let us read what is Written, and understand what we read, and then we shall believe with a perfect Faith. For what we say of the Natural Existence of *Christ*, within us, if we do not learn from him, we say foolishly and profanely; for he himself says, *My Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed*. There's no place left for doubting of the reality of his *Flesh* and *Blood*; for now, by the Profession of *Christ* himself, and by our *Faith*, 'tis truly *Flesh*, and truly *Blood*: Is not this Truth? It may indeed not be true to them, who deny *CHRIST* to be true *GOD*.

Lib. 3. Paral-lel. c. 45.

St. *Cyril of Jerusalem*. — 'Since therefore *Christ* himself does thus affirm, and say of the *Bread*, *This is my Body*; Who, from hence forward, dare be so bold as to doubt of it? And since the same [*Christ*] does assure us and say, *This is my Blood*; Who, I say, can doubt of it, and say, It is not his *Blood*? In *Cana of Galilee* he once, with his Sole Will, turn'd *Water* into *Wine*, which much resembles *Blood*; And does he not deserve to be Credited, that he chang'd *Wine* into his *Blood*? For, if when Invited to a *Corporal Marriage*, He wrought so stupendious a *Miracle*, have we not much more reason to confess, that he gave his *Body* and *Blood* to the *Children* of the *Bridegroom*? Wherefore, full of certainty, let us receive the *Body* and *Blood* of *CHRIST*: For under the Form of *Bread* is given to Thee the *Body*, and the *Blood* under the Form of *Wine*; that having receiv'd the *Body* and *Blood* of *CHRIST*, thou may'st be made Partaker with *Him* of his *Body* and *Blood*. Thus we shall become *Christophers*, that is, *Bearers* of *Christ*, receiving his *Body* and *Blood* into us. — Do not therefore look on it as mere *Bread* only, or bare *Wine*; for, as *God* himself has said, *IT IS* the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*. Notwithstanding, therefore, the Information of *Sense*, let *Faith* confirm thee; and do not judge of the thing by the *Taste*, but rather take it for most certain by *Faith*, without the least doubt that his *Body* and *Blood* are given thee. — When you come to the *Communion*, do not come holding both the *Palms* of your hands open, nor your *Fingers* spread; but let your *Left Hand* be as it were a rest under the *Right*, into which you are to receive so great a *KING*: And in the hollow of your *Hand* take the *Body* of *CHRIST*, saying, *Amen*.

In *Catecibus*.

*It was the Custom in those days for the Priest to deliver the Holy Sacra-ment into the hand of the Communicants*

*In Oras. Catec.*  
c. 37.

St. *Gregory Nyssen.* 'When we have Eaten any thing that is prejudicial to our Constitution, 'tis necessary that we take something that is capable of repairing what was damnify'd; that so, when this Healing Antidote is within us, it may work out of the Body, by a contrary Afection, all the force of the Poyson. And what is this Antidote? 'Tis nothing but that *Body* which overcame Death, and was the Origine of our Life. For, as the Apostle tells us, As a little Leaven makes the whole Lump like it self; so that *Body*, which by *GOD*'s appointment suffer'd Death, being receiv'd within our Body, changes and reduces the whole to it's own likeness. And as when Poyson is mixt up with any thing that it is Medicinable, the whole Compound is render'd useles; so likewise that Immortal Body being within him that receives it, converts the whole into its own Nature. But there being no other way of receiving any thing within our Body, unless it be first convey'd into our Stomach by Eating or Drinking, it is necessary that by this ordinary way of Nature, the Life-giving Vertue of the Spirit be Communicated to us. But now, since that Body alone, which was united to the Divinity, has receiv'd this Grace, and it is manifest, that our Body can no otherwise become Immortal; we are to consider how 'tis possible, that *One Body*, which is always distributed to so many Thousand Christians over the whole World, should be the Whole, by a Part in every One, and still remain Whole in it self.

And a little after. 'I do therefore now rightly believe, That the Bread Sanctified by the Word of God, is chang'd into the Body of God, the Word.—And here likewise the *Bread*, as the Apostle says, is Sanctify'd by the *Word of GOD* and *Prayer*; not so, that by being Eaten it becomes the *Body of the Word*, but because it is suddenly chang'd by the *Word* into his *Body*, by these words, *This is my Body*.—And this is effected by the Vertue of Benediction, by which the Nature of those things which appear, is Trans-elemented into it.

Again, in another place.—'And the Bread in the beginning is only common Bread; but when it is Sanctify'd by the Mystery, it is call'd and made the *BODY of CHRIST*.

St. *Hierom.* 'God forbid (says he) that I should speak detractingly of these Men, [Priests] who succeeding the Apostles in their Function, do make the Body of *CHRIST* with their Sacred Mouth.

*In Oras. in diem lumi- num.*

*In Epist. ad Heliodorium.*

*Lib. de Verb Apofi. Serm.*

St. *Augustin.* 'We have heard (says he) our Master, who always speaks Truth, our Divine Redeemer, the Saviour of Men, recommending to us our Ransom, his *Blood*: For he spake of his *Body* and *Blood*; which *Body* he call'd Meat, and which *Blood* he call'd Drink. The Faithful understand the Sacrament of the Faithful.—But there are some, says he, who do not believe they said, *This is an hard saying, who can hear him?* 'Tis an hard saying but to those who are Obstinate; that is, 'tis Incredible but to the Incredulous.

The same Holy Father, and Great Doctor, in his Commentary upon the XXXIII *Psalm*, speaks thus of *Christ*: 'And He was carry'd in his own hands. And can this, Brethren, be possible in Man? Was ever any Man carry'd in his own hands? He may be carry'd by the hands of others, but in his own no Man was ever yet carry'd. How this can be litterally understood of *David*, we cannot discover; but in *Christ* we find it verify'd: For *Christ* was carry'd in his own hands, when giving his own very *Body*, he said, *This is my Body*; for that *Body* he carried in his own hands. Such is the Humility of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, which is much recommended to Men.—How plain and positive are the words of these Ancient and Holy Fathers, for the *Real Presence* of *CHRIST*'s *BODY* and *BLOOD* in the Blessed Sacrament of the *En- chasit*, which *Protestants* so flatly deny? I would ask our *Church of England* Divines, Whether (if they had been present among the Apostles when *CHRIST* said, *Take and Eat, THIS IS MY BODY*) they durst have assum'd the boldness to have contradicted the Omnipotent Word, and have reply'd, *'Tis not thy BODY, Lord, 'tis only BREAD?* I believe the most stiff Sacramentarian in *England*, would have trembl'd to have made such a Reply; tho' now they dare, with blasphemous Mouth, call the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, the *Mystery of Iniquity*.

I have insisted somewhat the longer upon these two points, than perhaps the Reader may think proper for this Treatise: But when he considers that the *Priesthood* and *Sacrifice*, against which *Protestants* have Corrupted the Scripture, and fram'd their New Articles of Faith, are Two such Essential Parts of Christian Religion, That if either of them be taken away, the whole Fabrick of *God's Church* falls to the Ground; he will not look upon it as an unnecessary Digression.

Several other Corruptions and Falsifications, not mentioned under the aforesoing Heads.

**T**HIS Treatise encreasing beyond what indeed I design'd it at first, will oblige me to as much Brevity as possible, in these following Corruptions.

In *Romans* 8. ver. 39. instead of the word *Charity*, they (contrary to the Greek) translate *Love*; and so generally in all places, where much is spoken in commendation of *Charity*; the reason is, because they attribute Salvation to *Faith* alone, they care not how little *Charity* sound in the Peoples Ears. — So likewise in the 1 *Cor. cap. 13.* for *Charity*, they Eight times say *Love*. In *Rom. 9. ver. 16.* for this Text, [*Therefore it is not of the Willer, nor the Runner, but of G O D that sheweth Mercy;*] they translate in their Old Bibles, — So lyeth it not then in a Man's Will or Running, but in the Mercy of G O D; changing [*Of*] into [*In*], and [*Willer and Runner*] into [*Will and Running*]; and so make the Apostle say, That it is not at all in Man's Will to Consent or Co-operate with G O D's Grace and Mercy.

In *1 Corinthians cap. 1. ver. 10.* for *Schisms* (which are Spiritual Divisions from the Unity of the Church) they translate *Diffentions*, which may be in Worldly things, as well as Religion; this is done because themselves were afraid to be accounted Schismaticks: So likewise,

In *Galatians 5. ver. 20.* for *Heresie*, as it is in the Greek, they translate *Sects*; in favour of themselves, being charg'd with Heresie: Also,

In *Titus 3. ver. 10.* instead of saying, according to the Greek, *A Man that is an Heretick, &c.* Their Bible of 1562. translates, *A Man that is an Author of Sects*: favouring that Name for their own sakes, and dissembling it as tho' the Holy Scripture spake not against *Heresie* or *Heresicks, Schism or Schismaticks*.

In *1 Timothy, cap. 3. ver. 6.* for a *Neophyte*, (one lately Baptized or Planted in *CHRIST's* Mystical Body) they translate in their first Bibles, *A Young Scholar*; as tho' an *Old Scholar* could not be a *Neophyte*, by deferring his Baptism, or by long delaying his Conversion to *G O D*, which he learn'd to be necessary long before.

In *Tit. 3. ver. 8.* instead of these words, [*To Excel in good Works,*] they translate, *To shew forth Good Works*; and (as their Last Edition has it) *To maintain Good Works*; Against the different degrees of *Good Works*.

In *Hebrews 10. ver. 20.* for *Dedicated*, they translate, in their First Bibles, *Prepared*, in favour of their *Heresie*, That *CHRIST* was not the first that went into *Heaven*, which the word [*Dedicated*] signifies.

In the *II Epistle of Peter, cap. 3. ver. 16.* they force the Text to maintain a frivolous Evasion, [*That St. Paul's Epistles are not hard,*] but the *Things in the Epistles*; whereas both the *Greek* and *Latin* Texts are indifferent to both Constructions: It is a general Custom of theirs, that where they find the *Greek* Text indifferent to Two Senses, there they restrain it only to that which may most advantage their own Error, thereby excluding its Reference to the other Sense. And oftentimes, where one Sense is receiv'd, read, and expounded of the greater part of the Ancient Fathers, and of all the *Latin* Church, there they very Partially follow the other Sense, not so generally receiv'd.

In *St. James 1. ver. 13.* for, [*God is not a Tempter of Evils.*] they tranflate, *God is not Tempted with Evils*, and, *God cannot be Tempted with Evils*; which is so Impertinent to the Apostles Speech in that place, as nothing more. Why is it that they refuse to say, *God is no Tempter to Evil*, as well as the other? Is it because of the *Greek* Word, which is a *Passive*? They may find in their Lexicon, that it is both an *Active* and *Passive*; as also appears by the very circumstance of the foregoing words, *Let no Man say, That he is Tempted of God*. Why so? *Because* (say the Protestant Translators) *God is not Tempted with Evil*. Is this a good Reason? Nothing less. How then? *Because God is no Tempter to Evil*: therefore, let no Man say, *That he is Tempted of G O D*.

This Reason is so coherent, and so necessary in this place, That if the *Greek* Word were only a *Passive* (as it is not,) yet it might have better seem'd *Beset* to translate it *Actively*, than it did

*ἀπειπειος*  
*εργαζειν*.

ANOT. NO.  
TEST. ANNO  
1556.  
M. C. 6. v. 13.

to turn an *Active* into a *Passive*, against the *Real Presence*, as himself confesses he did without scruple. But tho' he might and ought to have translated this word *Actively*, yet he would not, because he would favour his own *Heresie*; which ( quite contrary to these words of the Apostle ) says, *That God is a Tempter to Evil*: His words are, *Inducit Dominum in tentationem eos quos Satan arbitrio permitit, &c.* 'The Lord leads into Temptation, those whom he permits to 'Satan's Arbitriment; or into whom rather he leads or brings in Satan himself, to fill their Heart, as Peter speaketh. Note, that he says, *GOD* brings Satan into a Man to fill his Heart, as Peter said to *Ananias*; *Why has Satan fill'd thy Heart, to lye unto the Holy Ghost?* So that by this Doctrine of *Beza's*, *GOD* brought Satan into *Ananias's* Heart to make him Lye unto the Holy Ghost; and so leading him into Temptation, was *Author* and *Cause* of that Heinous Sin.

Is not this to say, *GOD is a Tempter to Evil*, quite contrary to St. James's Words? Or could he that is of this Opinion, translate the contrary; to wit, *That GOD is no Tempter to Evil*? Is not this as much as to say, *That GOD also brought Satan into Judas to fill his Heart*, and so was *Author* of *Judas's* *Treason*, even as he was of *Paul's* *Conversion*? Is not this a most absurd and blasphemous Opinion; yet how can they free themselves from it, who allow and maintain the aforesaid Exposition of *God's leading into Temptation*? Nay *Beza*, for maintaining the same, translates, *God's Providence*, instead of *God's Prescience* (*Acts 2. ver. 23*) a Version so false, that the *English Bezites*, in their Translation, are ashamed to follow him.

\* See Bucer's  
Scripta Anglicana, p. 931.  
Et in Epis.  
ad Rom. in  
c. 1. p. 94.  
1 Pet. c. 2. v. 8.

Illyricus's  
Gloss in 1 Pet.  
c. 2. ver. 8.

Vid. Castilio  
in defensione  
uersi translat.  
P. 153, 154,  
155.

And which is worse than all this, if worse can be, They make *GOD* not only a Leader of Men into Temptation, but even the Author and Worker of Sin; Yea, that *God* created or appointed Men to Sin, as appears too plainly, not only in their Translation of this following Text of St. Peter's, but also from *Beza's* Commentary on the same. Also *Bucer*, one of King *Edward the Sixth's* Apostles, held directly, \* *That GOD is the Author of Sin*.

St. Peter says of the *Jews*, that *Christ* is to them, *Petra scandali qui offendunt verbo nec credunt in quo & positi sunt [ eis o' nai 6tignou; ]* that is, *A Rock of scandal to them* [the *Jews*] that stumble at the Word, neither do believe wherein also they are put, as the *Rhemist* Testament translates it: Or as 'tis render'd in King *Edward the Sixth's* *English* Translation, and in the First of Queen *Elizabeth's*, *They believe not that whereon they were set*: Which Translation *Illyricus* approves, saying, 'This is well to be mark'd, lest a Man imagine that *GOD* himself did put them, and ( as One, meaning *Beza*, against the Nature of the *Greek* Word, translates and interprets it ) that *GOD* created them for this purpose, that they should withstand him. *Erasmus* and *Calvin*, referring this word to that which goes before, Interpret it not amiss, *That the Jews were made or ordain'd to Believe the Word of GOD*, and their *Messias*; but yet that they would not believe him: For to them belong'd the Promises, the Testaments, and the *Messias* himself; as St. Peter says, *Acts 2*, and *3*. and *Paul, Rom. 9*. And to them were committed the Oracles of *GOD*, by witness of the same *Paul, Rom. 3*. Thus *Illyricus*; who has here given the true Sense of this Text, according to the signification of the *Greek* Word; and has prov'd the same by Scripture, by St. Peter and St. *Paul*, and has confis'm'd it by *Erasmus* and *Calvin*. Yea *Luther* follows the same Sense in this place: So does *Castilio* in his *Anno-New-Testament*.

Yet *Beza*, against all these ( to defend his blasphemous Doctrine, that *God leads Men into Temptation, and brings in Satan to fill their Hearts* ) translates it thus: *Sunt immorigeri ad quod etiam conditi fuerunt. — They are Rebellious, whereunto also they were Created*: With whom his Scholars, our *English* Translators, are resolv'd to agree; therefore, in their Bible of the Year 1577. they read, — *Being disobedient unto the which thing they were Ordained*. And in that of 1572. *Being disobedient unto the which thing they were even Ordained*: This is yet worse, And with this, word for word, agrees the Testament of 1580. and the *Scotish* Bible of 1579. This is also the *Geneva* Translation in the Bible of 1561. which the *French Geneva* Bible follows. And how much our *Protestant* last Translation differs from these, may be seen in the Bible Printed at *London*, *Anno 1683*. where 'tis read thus: *And a Rock of Offence, even to them which stumble at the Word, being disobedient whereunto also they are appointed*.

Is not this to say positively, *That GOD is Author of Mens Disobedience or Rebellion against CHRIST?* 'But if *GOD* (says *Castilio* against *Beza*) have Created some Men to Rebellion 'or Disobedience, he is Author of their Disobedience; as if he has Created some to Obedience, 'he is truly Author of their Obedience. Yes, this is to make *GOD* the Author of Mens Sin, for

for which purpose it was so Translated: And thus *Beza* in his Notes upon the Text explices it; 'That Men are made or Fashion'd, Fram'd, Stir'd up, Created or Ordain'd, not of themselves (for that were absurd) but of *GOD*, to be Scandaliz'd at him, and his Son our Saviour; *Christus est eis offendicula, prout esiam ad hoc ipsum à Deo sunt Conditus*: And further discourses at large, and brings other Texts to prove this Sense, and this Translation.

And tho' *Luther* and *Calvin* (as is said) dissented not from the True Sense of this Text, yet touching the blasphemous Doctrine, [*That GOD is the Author of Sin*,] they with *Zwinglius* must, for all this, have the Right-Hand of *Beza*. 'How can Man prepare himself to Good, says *Luther*, 'seeing 'tis not in his Power to make his ways Evil? For *GOD* works the wicked Work in the Wicked.'

'When we commit Adultery or Murder, (*says Zwinglius*) 'tis the Work of *GOD*, being the Mover, the Author, and Inciter, &c. *GOD* moves the Thief to Kill, &c. He is forc'd to Sin, &c. *GOD* harden'd *Pharaoh*, not speaking Hyperbolically, but he truly hardens him, yea, although he resist. — By which, and other of his Writings, he so plainly teaches *GOD* to be the Author of Sin, that he is therefore particularly reprehended by the Learned Protestant *Graverus*, in *Absurda Absurdorum c. 5. de Predat. fol. 3, 4.*

'*GOD* is Author (*says Calvin*) of all those things, which these Popish Judges would have to happen only by his Idle Sufferance. He also affirms our Sins to be not only by *GOD*'s Permission, but by *Hu Decree and Will*: Which Blasphemy is so evidently Taught by him and his Followers, that they are expressly condemn'd for it, by their Famous Brethren; *Feming. lib. de univer. Grat. p. 109. Osiander Enchirid. Controv. p. 104. Scaffman. de peccat. causis p. 155. 27. Sitzlinus disput. Theol. de Provid. Dei, Sect. 141. Graver. in Absurda Absurd. in frontisp.* Yea, the Protestant Magistrates of *Berse* made it Penal by their Laws, for any in their Territories to Preach *Calvin's* Doctrine thereof, or for the People to read any of his Books concerning the same. Are not these blessed Reformers? O Excellent Instruments of *GOD*'s! as Dr. *Tenison* styles the Chief of them.

Protestants denying *Free-Will* in Man, not only to do Good, but even to resist Evil, open a very wide passage into this impious Doctrine, of making *GOD* the Author of Sin.

In *1 St. Peter, cap. 1. ver. 22.* the Apostle exhorts Christians to live as becomes Men of so excellent a Vocation: *Purifying*, says he, *your Souls by Obedience of Charity, &c.* (a little before, ver. 17.) remembering always, that *GOD*, *without exception of Persons*, *judges every Man according to his Works*. From which places it appears, that we have *Free-will* working with the Grace of *GOD*; That we purifie and cleanse our Souls from Sin; That Good Works are necessarily requir'd of Christians: For by many Divine Arguments *St. Peter* urges this Conclusion, *Ut Animas nostras Castificemus, That we purifie our own Souls*. So the Protestant Translation, made in *Edward the Sixth's* Time, has it, [*Forasmuch as you have purified your Souls.*] So likewise one of *Queen Elizabeth's* Bibles, [*Even ye which have purified your Souls.*] And so it is in the Greek. Notwithstanding all which, *Beza* in his Testaments of 1556, and 1565, translates it, *Animabus vestris purificatis obediendo veritati per Spiritum*: which another of *Queen Elizabeth's* Bibles render thus, *Seeing your Souls are purified in obeying the Truth, through the Spirit*. So translates also the *English* Bible, Printed at *Geneva*, 1561. and the *Scrobb*, Printed at *Edenborough*, 1579.

So that these words make nothing at all either for *Free will*, or *Co-operation* with *GOD*'s Grace, or Value of Good Works, but rather the contrary; proving that in our Justification we work not, but are Wrought; we purifie not our selves, but are Purified; we are not Active and Doers with *GOD*'s Grace, but Passive and Sufferers: Which Opinion the Council of *Trent* condemns. The Protestant Bible of 1683. has again Corrected this, and translates, *Seeing ye have purified your Souls, &c.* but whether with any good and sincere Intention, appears by their having left uncorrected another Fault of the same stamp in *Philippians, cap. 1. ver. 28.*

Where *St. Paul*, handling the same Argument, Exhorts the Christians not to fear the Enemies of *Christ*, tho' they persecute never so terribly, *Which to them (says he) is cause of Perdition, but to you of Salvation*: where he makes Good Works necessary, and so the Causes of Salvation, as Sins are of Damnation. But *Beza* will have the Old Interpreter over-seen in so translating, *Because (says he) the affliction of the faithful is never call'd the cause of their salvation, but the testimony*: And therefore translates the Greek Word, *Ιδει, Indicium*. And his Scholars, the *English* Translators, render it a *Token*, tho' indeed one of their Testaments translate it as we do,

*Lut. To. 2.*  
*Witten. An.*  
*1551. Affer.*  
*A. 1. 36. Vid.*  
*de Servo. Ar-*  
*bit. fol. 195.*  
*Edit. 1603.*  
*Zuing. To. 10.*  
*de Providentia*  
*Dei fol. 365,*  
*366, 367.*  
*Calvin Instit.*  
*1. 1. c. 18. &*  
*1. 2. c. 4. and*  
*1. 3. c. 23.*

*Vid. Litteras*  
*Senat. Bern.*  
*ad Ministras,*  
*&c. An. 1555.*  
*Dr. Ten. Conf.*  
*with M. P.*

*Castificantes*  
*animas vestras*  
*in obedientia*  
*Charitatis.*

*Bib. 1561.*  
*1579.*

*Seff. 6. cap. 4.*

*Beza Aen. in*  
*illum locum.*

Bib. 2561. a *Cause*; so does also *Erasmus*, and the *Tigurine* Translator: Yea, the Apostles comparing Sins with Good Works, these leading to Heaven, as those to Hell, convinces its Sense to be so; as *Theodore* a Greek Father, also gathers from that Word; saying, *That procures to them Destruction, but to you Salvation*. So St. *Augustin*, St. *Hierom*, and other *Latin* Fathers.

Theod. in Phil. cap. 1. And that Good Works are a cause of Salvation, our Saviour himself clearly shews, when He thus speaks of *Mary Magdalen*, *Remittuntur ei peccata multa, quoniam dilexit multum*; *Many Sins are forgiven her, because she loved much*. Against which no Man living can cavil from the *Greek*, *Hebrew*, or *Latin*, but that Works of Charity are a *Cause* why Sins are Forgiven; and so a *Cause* of our Justification and Salvation, which is evidently the Words and Meaning of our Blessed Saviour. Notwithstanding, *Beza* and our *English* Translators have a shift for this also; he translates, *Remissa sunt peccata ejus multa. Nam dilexit multum*; which in our *English* Bible is render'd, *Her Sins which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much*: which the Reader perhaps may think to be a Difference so small, as is not worth taking notice of; but, if well consider'd, will be found as great, as is between *Our Doctrine and Protestants*. And first, The Text is Corrupted by making a fuller Point than either the *Greek* or *Latin* bears, the *English* making some a Colon, (:) and some a Semicolon, (;) where in *Greek* there is only a *Comma*, (,) and *Beza*, in his *Latin*, yet more desperately makes a down and full *Period*, (.) thereby dividing and distracting the latter part from the former; as tho' it contain'd not a reason of that which went before, as it does, but were some new Matter: wherein he is controul'd by another of his own Translators, and by the *Greek* Prints of *Geneva*, *Zurick*, *Basil*, and other *German* Cities, who point it as it is in our *Latin* and *English*. — But their Falshood appears much more in turning [*Quoniam*] into [*Nam*,] *Because* into *For*.

1556.

Seeing our Saviours words are in effect thus, [*Because she loved much, therefore many Sins are forgiven her*]; which they, by this *Perversion* and *Mispointing* it, make a quite different, and almost contrary Sense; thus, [*Because she had many Sins forgiven her, therefore she loveth much*]; and this Love following was a Token of the Remission, which she, by *Only Faith*, had obtain'd before; so turning the *Cause* into the *Effect*, and the *Antecedent* into the *Consequent*, hereby utterly overthrowing the *Doctrine*, which *CHRIST* by his *Words* and *Reason* gives, and the *Church* of his *Words* and *Reason* gathers. *Beza* blushes not to confess, why he thus alter'd *CHRIST*'s words: saying, ' *Nam dilexit, n̄d̄m̄*, For she loved: The *Vulgar Translation* and *Erasmus* turn it, ' [*Because she loved*;] But I (*says he*) had rather Interpret it as I do, that Men may best understand in these words to be shew'd, not the cause of Remission of Sins, but rather that which ensu'd after such Remission, and that by the *Consequent* is gather'd the *Antecedent*. And therefore, they who abuse this place, to overthrow *Free Justification* by *Only Faith*, are very *Impudent* and *Childish*: Thus *Beza*. But the *Ancient Fathers*, who were neither *Impudent* nor *Childish*, gather'd from this Text, that *CHARITY*, as well as *FAITH*, is requisite for the obtaining Remission of Sins. St. *Chrysostome*, Hom. 6. in *Mat.* says, ' As first by Water and the Spirit, so afterward, by Tears and Confession, we are made clean: which he proves by this place. So St. *Gregory*, expounding this same place, says, ' Many Sins are forgiven her, because ' she loved much; as if it had been said expresly, He burns out perfectly the rust of Sin, who ' soever burns vehemently with the Fire of Love. For so much more is the Rust of Sin scour'd ' away, by how much more the Heart of a Sinner is inflam'd with the great Fire of *Charity*.

Beza in Luck.  
7. v. 47.

And St. *Ambrose* upon the same words.— ' Good are Tears, which are able to wash away our Sins. Good are Tears, wherein is not only the *Redemption* of Sinners, but also the *refreshing* of the Just.

Hom. 23. in Euseb.

And the Great St. *Augustin*, debating this Story in a long Homily, says; ' This Sinful Woman, ' the more she Ow'd, the more she Lov'd; the Forgiver of her Debts, our Lord himself, affirming so: Many Sins are forgiven her, because she loved much. And why Loved she much, but ' because she Owed much? Why did she all these Offices (of Weeping, Washing, &c.) but to obtain Remission of her Sins? Other Holy Fathers agree in the self-same Verity, all making her *Love* to be a *Cause* going before, not only an *Effect* or *Sequel* coming after the Remission of Sins.

I have only taken notice here, how *Beza*, and our *English* Translators have Corrupted this Text; but he, who pleases to read *Augustinus, in locis Communibus, c. de Justificari. 11. 5.* will find him perverting it after another strange manner, by boldly asserting, without all reason or probable conjecture, That our Blessed Saviour spoke in *Hebrew*, and us'd the *Proterperfect* for the *Present*

Present Tense; and that St. Luke writ in the Dorical Dialect; so that *Musculus* would have it said, *She Loved CHRIST much, and no wonder; she had good Cause so to do, because many Sins were forgiven her.*

But *Zwinglius* goes yet another way to work with this Text, and tells us, That he supposes the word [*Love*] should have been [*Faith*:] His words are, — ‘ Because she loved much. I suppose, that *Love* is here put for *Faith*; Because she has so great affiance in me, so many Sins are forgiven her. For he says afterwards, *Thy Faith hath saved thee*; that is, has deliver'd and absolv'd thee from thy Sins. — Which one distinction of his, will Answer all the Places that in this Controversie can be brought out of Scripture to refel their *Only Faith*. But, to conclude, What can be more Impious, than to affirm, That for obtaining Remission of Sins, *Charity* is not requir'd as well as *Faith*, seeing our Blessed Saviour, in this place, (if we'll credit his Evangelist St. Luke, and I think his Authority ought to be preferr'd before that of *Zwinglius*, *Beza*, *Musculus*, or our English Sectaries) most divinely conjoyns *Charity* with *Faith*, saying of *Charity*, *Many Sins are forgiven her, because she Loved much?* Straight-way adding (of *Faith*,) *Thy Faith has made thee safe; go in Peace.*

As you see here, they use all their endeavours to suppress the necessity of Good and Charitable Works; so, on the other side, they endeavour'd to make their first Bibles countenance Vice, so far as to seem to allow of the detestable Sin of *Usury*, so it were not hurtful to the Borrower. In *Deuteronomy 23. ver. 19.* they translate thus, *Thou shalt not hurt thy Brother by Usury of Money, nor by Usury of Corn, nor by Usury of any thing that he may be hurt withal:* By which they would have it meant, that *Usury* is not here forbidden, unleis it *hurt* the Party that Borrows. A Conceit so rooted in most Men's Hearts, that they think such *Usury* very Lawful, and therefore frequently Offend therein. But Almighty *GOD*, in this place of Holy Scripture, has not one word of *Hurting*, or *not Hurting*, as may be seen in the *Hebrew* and *Greek*; and as also appears from their having Corrected the same in their Bible of 1683. where they read, (as it ought to be) *Thou shalt not lend upon Usury to thy Brother, Usury of Money, Usury of Victuals, Usury of any thing that is lent upon Usury.* — If the *Hebrew* Word signifie to *Hurt* by *Usury*, why did not they in the very next words following, in the self-same Bibles, translate it thus, *Unto a Stranger thou mayst lend upon Usury, but not unto thy Brother?* Why said they not rather, *A Stranger thou mayst hurt by Usury, but not thy Brother?* Is it not all one Word and Phrase here and before? The *Jews* would have given them Thanks for so translating; who, by forcing the *Hebrew* Word as *They do*, think it well done, to hurt any Stranger, that is, any *Christian*, by *Usury*, be it never so great.

Whether the first Protestant Translators of the Scriptures were guided by that Spirit, which should be in *Christian Catholick* Translators, may be easily gather'd from what follows, as well as from what you have already seen.

They were so Prophane and Dissolute, that some of them term'd that Divine Book call'd, *Canticum Cantorum*, containing the high Mystery of *CHRIST*, and his *Church*, *The Ballet of Ballers of Solomon*, as if it were a *Ballet of Love*, between *Solomon* and his *Concubines*, as *Casta* so wantonly translated it.

And yet more prophane, in another place, which even their last Translation has not yet vouchsafed to Correct, [We have Conceived, we have born in Pain, as tho' we should have brought forth Wind.] I am ashamed to set down the litteral Commentary of this their Translation: Was there any thing in the *Hebrew* to hinder them from Translating it in this manner, *We have Conceived, and as it were Travelled to bring forth, and have brought forth the Spirit?* Why should they say *Wind* rather than *Spirit*? They are not Ignorant, that the *Septuagint* in *Greek*, and the Ancient Fathers, do all Expound it, according to both the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, of the *Spirit of GOD*, which is first Conceived in us, and begins by *Fear*, which the Scripture calls, *The beginning of Wisdom*: In somuch, that in the *Greek* there are these Godly words, Famous in all Antiquity. — *Through the Fear of thee, O Lord, we Conceived, and have Travelled with Pain, and have brought forth the Spirit of thy Salvation, which thou hast made upon the Earth:* which excellently sets before our Eyes the degrees of a Faithful Man's Increase, and proceeding in the *Spirit of GOD*. But to say, *We have been with Child*, (as their last Translation has it) and have brought forth *Wind*, can admit no Spiritual Interpretation; but even as a mere *few* should translate or understand it, who has no sense of the *Spirit of GOD*. It is the custom of *Protestants*, in all

*Zwing. in  
Luc. 7. 20. 4.*

*Bib. 1562,  
1577.*

*Isaiah c. 16.  
ver. 18.*

*St. Ambrose,  
lib. 2. de In-  
terpret. c. 4.  
Chrysostome,  
in Psal. 7.  
prop. fin.  
See S. Hieron  
upon this  
place.*

*Bib. 1683.*

such cases as this, where the richer Sense is of GOD's Holy Spirit, there to translate Wind, as in *Psal. 147. ver. 18.*

*Isai. 30. v. 10.*

It is not unlike to this, that they will not translate for the Angel's Honor that carried *Abacuc*, *He set him into Babylon, over the Lake, by the force of his Spirit*; but thus, *Through a Mighty Wind*: So attributing it to the Wind, not to the Angels Power, and omitting quite the Greek Word [*ενεστηκεν*] *Him*, which sheweth plainly, that it was the Angel's Spirit, Force, and Power.

*Joel 2. v. 23.*

Again, where the Prophet *Isaias* speaks most manifestly of *CHRIST*, saying, *And (our Lord) shall not cause thy Doctor to fly from thee any more, and thine Eyes shall see thy Master*; (which is all one in effect with that which *CHRIST* says, *I will be with you unto the end of the World*) there one of their Bibles translates thus, *Thy Rain shall be no more kept back, but thine Eyes shall see thy Rain*. Their last Translation has Corrected this mad Falsification.

לְמִזְבֵּחַ  
*Lyra. in 30.*  
*Isai.*

Again, where the Holy Church reads, [*Rejoice, ye Children of Sion, in the Lord your GOD, because he has given you the Doctor of Justice*;] there one of their Translations has it, *The Rain of Righteousness*: And their last Bible, instead of Correcting the former, makes it yet worse, (if it can be made worse) saying, *Be glad then, ye Children of Sion, &c. for he hath given you the former Rain moderately*. Does the Hebrew Word force them to this? Doubtless they cannot but know, that it signifies a *Teacher* or *Master*: And therefore, even the *Jews* themselves, partly understand it of *Esdras*, partly of *Christ's* Divinity: Yet these New and Partial Translators are resolv'd to be more Prophane than the very *Jews*. If they had (as I hinted above) been guided by a *Calvillian* and *Christian* Spirit, they might have been satisfy'd with the Sense of St. *Hierom*, a *Christian* Doctor, upon these places, who makes no doubt but the Hebrew is *Doctor, Master, Teacher*; who also in the *Psalm* translates thus, [*With Blessings shall the Doctor be Arrayed*,] meaning *CHRIST*; Where *Protestants* (with the *Jews* of latter days, the Enemies of *CHRIST*) translate, *The Rain covers the Pools*. What cold stuff is this, in respect of that other Translation, so clearly pointing to *CHRIST* our *Doctor, Master, and Lawgiver*.

And again, where St. *Jerom*, and all the Fathers translate and expound, *There shall be Faith in thy Times*, to express the wonderful *Faith* that shall be among *Christians*; there they translate, *There shall be Stability of thy Times*. And their last Bible has it thus, *And Wisdom and Knowledge shall be the Stability of thy Times*: Whereas the Prophet reckons all these Vertues singly, viz. Judgment, Justice, (which they term Righteousness) *Faith, Wisdom, Knowledge, and the Fear of our Lord*; but they, for a little Ambiguity of the Hebrew Word, turn *Faith* into *Stability*.

In *Isai. 37. ver. 22.* All their first Bibles read, — *O Virgin Daughter of Sion, he hath despised thee, and laughed thee to scorn: O Daughter of Jerusalem, he hath shaken his Head at thee*. In the Hebrew, Greek, St. *Hierom*'s Translation and Commentary, as also in the Protestant last Bible, Printed 1683, it is quite contrary, viz. *The Virgin Daughter of Sion has despised thee, [O Assur:] The Daughter of Jerusalem has shaken her Head at thee*. All are the *Feminine Gender*, and spoken of *Sion*, litterally triumphing over *Assur*; and of the *Church*, Spiritually triumphing over *Heresies*, and all her Enemies. In their first Bibles, they translated all as of the *Male* *Gender*, thereby applying it to *Assur*; insulting against *Sion* and *Jerusalem*. But for what cause or reason they thus falsifie it, will be hard to determine, unless they dreaded, that by translating it otherwise it might be applyed Spiritually to the *Church's* Triumphing over *Themselves*, as *Her* Enemies. We cannot judge it an over-fight in them, because we find it so translated in the Fourth Book of *Kings*, *cap. 19. ver. 21.* yea, and in all their first Translations.

A great many other Faults are found in their first Translations, which might be pass'd by, as not done upon any ill design, but perhaps rather as Mistakes or Over-sights: yet however, touching some few of them, 'twill not be a mis to demand a Reason, why they were committed: As for Example, why they translated, — [*Ye Abjects of the Gentiles, Isai. 45. ver. 20.*] rather than, *Ye, who are saved of the Gentiles*; or, as their last Translation has it, *Ye, that are escaped of the Nations?* Or,

*Canticz.*  
*Canticor.*  
*c. 8. ver. 12.*

Why in their Bible of 1579. did they write, at length, [*Two Thousand to them that keep the Fruitt thereof*,] rather than, *Two Hundred*; as it is in the Hebrew and Greek, and as now their last Bible has it? Or,

*Canticz.*  
*Canticor.*  
*c. 1. ver. 4.*  
*Isai. 7. v. 11.*

Why read they in some of their Bibles, — [*As the Fruitts of Cedar*, and not rather according to the Greek and Hebrew, *Tabernacles of Cedar*; or however, as their last Translation has it, *Tents of Kedar*? Or,

Why

Why translate they, — [Ask a Sign, either in the depth, or in the height above,] rather than, Ask a Sign, either in the depth of Hell, &c. as the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin has it? Or,

Why do they translate, [To make ready an Horse] rather than Beasts, as the Greek has it; and as also now their Edition of 1683 reads it? Or,

Why translate they, [If a Man on the Sabbath-Day receive Circumcision, without breaking the Law of Moyses,] rather than according to the Greek, which their last Translation has follow'd. If a Man on the Sabbath-Day receive Circumcision, to the end the Law of Moyses should not be broken? Gr,

Why read they, — [The Son of Man must suffer many things, and be reproved of the Elders,] for, be rejected of the Elders, as the Greek, and now their Bible of 1683. have it; and as in the Psalm, The Stone which the Builders rejected; we say not, reproving of the said Stone, which is CHRIST?

Again, Why translate they thus, [Many which had seen the first House, when the Foundations of this House was laid before their Eyes, wept, &c.] when in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, 'tis read thus: Many who had seen the first House in the Foundation thereof, (i. e. yet standing upon the Foundation, undestroyed) and this Temple before their Eyes, wept? I suppose they imagin'd, that it should be meant they saw Solomon's Temple when 'twas first Founded; which, because 'twas impossible, they translated otherwise than 'tis in the Hebrew and Greek; they should indeed have consider'd better of it.

Tho' we do not look upon several of these, as done (I say) with any ill design; yet we cannot excuse them of being done with much more Licentious Boldness, than ought to appear in sincere and honest Translators.

### Absurdities in turning Psalms into Metre.

Their unrestrain'd Licentiousness is yet further manifest, in their turning of David's Psalms into Rhyme (without reason,) and then Singing them in their Congregations; telling the People (from St. James, cap. 5.) If any be Merry, let him Sing Psalms; being resolv'd to do nothing but what they produce a Text of Scripture for, tho' of their own Making: For, tho' the Apostle Exhorts Such as are Heavy, to Pray; and, Such as are Merry, to Sing; yet he does not in particular appoint David's Psalms to be Sung by the Merry, no more than he appoints our Lord's Prayer to be said by such as he Exhorts to Pray, (tho' perhaps he meant it of both:) So that for any thing our bold Interpreters can gather from the Text, [Equo animo est? Psalms. Psalmo.] St. James might mean other Spiritual Songs and Hymns, as well as David's Psalms: But be it that he exhorted them to Sing David's Psalms, which we have no cause to deny, because the Church of Christ has ever us'd the same; yet, that he meant it of such Nonsensical Rhymes, as T. Sternhold, J. Hopkins, Robert Wisdom, and other Protestant Poets have made to be Sung in their Churches, under the name of David's Psalms, none can ever grant, who has read them. It has hitherto been the Practice of GOD's Church, to sing David's Psalms, as truly translated from the Hebrew into Latin; but never to sing such Songs as Hopkins and Sternhold have turn'd from the English Prose into Metre: Neither do I think, that Sober and Judicious Protestants themselves can look upon them as good Forms of Praises to be Sung in their Churches, to the Glory, Honour, and Service of so Great, so Good, and so Wise a GOD, when they shall consider how full they are fraught with Nonsense, and ridiculous Absurdities, besides many gross Corruptions, (viz. above Two Hundred \*), confess'd by Protestants themselves to be found in the Psalms in Prose, from which these were turn'd into Metre, which we may guess are scarce Corrected by the Rhyme:) To Collect all the Faults committed by the said Blessed Poets in their Psalm-Metre, would be a Task too tedious for my design'd Brevity: I will therefore only set down some few of their Absurd and Ridiculous Expressions; and for the rest, leave the Reader to compare these Psalms in Metre with the other in Prose, even as by Themselves Translated.

\* See the Preface.

PSALM  
and  
VERSE.PSALMS in Prose,  
Bible 1683.

ii. ver. 3.

*Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their Cords from us.*

xvi. v. 9, 10.

*Therefore my Heart is Glad, and my Glory rejoiceth: My Flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my Soul in Hell, &c.*

xviii. v. 36.

*Thou hast enlarged my steps under me, that my Feet did not slip.*

ib. v. 37.

*I have pursued mine Enemies, and overtaken them: Neither did I turn again till they were consumed.*

xxii. v. 7.

*All they that see me, laugh me to scorn. They shoot out the Lip, they shake the Head.*

ib. v. 12.

*Many Bulls have compassed me, strong Bulls of Basan have beft me round.*

xxvi. v. 10.

*In whose hand is Mischief, and their Right-hand is full of Bribes.*

xlix. v. 20.

*Man that is in Honour, and understandeth not, is like the Beasts that Perish.*

lxxiv. v. 11,  
& 12.

*Why withdraweth thou thy hand, even thy Right-hand? Pluck it out of thy Bosom.*

PSALMS in Metre,  
Bible 1683.

Shall we be bound to them, say they,  
Let all their Bonds be broke,  
And of their Doctrine and their Law,  
Let us reject the Yoke.

Wherefore my Heart and Tongue also,  
Do both rejoice together;  
My Flesh and Body rest in hope,  
When I this thing consider.  
Thou wilt not leave my Soul in Grave,  
For Lord thou lovest me, &c.

And under me thou makest plain  
The Way where I should walk:  
So that my Feet shall never slip,  
Nor stumble at a Balk.

So I suppress and wound my Foes,  
That they can rise no more:  
For at my Feet they fall down flat,  
I strike them all so sore.

All Men despise, as they behold  
me walking on the way: (&c.)  
They Grin, they Mow, they Nod their heads

So many Bulls do compass me,  
That be full strong of Head:  
Tea, Bulls so far, as tho' they had  
In Basan Field been fed.

Whose hands are heapt with Craft & Guile  
Their Lives thereof are full.  
And their Right-hand with wrench & wile,  
For Bribes doth pluck and pull.

Thus Man to Honor God hath brought,  
Yet doth he not consider;  
But like brute Beast, so doth he live,  
And turn to Dust and Powder.

Why dost thou draw thy hand a back,  
And hide it in thy Lap?  
O pluck it out, and be not slack,  
To give thy Foes a rap.

The Reader need not  
be told why this is ad-  
ded, besides its making  
up the Rhyme.

What they translate  
Glory in Prose, they  
call Tongue in Rhyme.  
And for want of one  
Foot to make up another  
Verse, they thrust in a  
whole Body, [Flesh and  
Body.] Again, what  
in Prose is call'd Hell,  
in Rhyme they term  
Grave: as if Souls  
were left in the Grave.

This Warrior lays  
about him at another  
kind of rate than Da-  
vid did,

We have heard of Crafty Heads, but never of  
Crafty Hands.

In the Title Page they  
say, [If any be Merry,  
let him Sing Psalms.]  
But considering what  
Psalms they are, they  
might have done as well  
to have said rather, [If  
any WOULD be Mer-  
ry, let him Sing Psalms.]

PSALM and VERSE.	PSALMS in Prose. Bible 1683.	PSALMS in Metre, Bible 1683.
lxxviii. v. 16	---- <i>He caused Waters to run down like Rivers.</i>	---Of such abundance, that <i>no Floods to them might be compared.</i>
lxxviii. v. 57	---- <i>They were turned aside like a deceitful Bow.</i>	---- They went astray, Much like a Bow that would not bend, But slip and start away.
lxxxix. v. 46.	<i>The days of his Youth hast thou shortned: Thou hast covered him with shame. Selah.</i>	Thou hast cut off, and made full short His Youth and lusty days; <i>And rais'd of him an ill report,</i> <i>With shame and great dispraise.</i>
xcvii. v. 12.	<i>Light is sown for the Righteous, and gladness to the upright in Heart.</i>	And Light doth spring up to the Just, With Pleasure for his part, (Ec. Great Joy with Gladness, Mirth and Lust,
xcix. v. 1.	<i>The Lord reigneth, let the People tremble; he sitteth between the Cherubims, let the Earth be moved.</i>	The Lord doth Reign, although at it <i>The People rage full sore:</i> Yea he on Cherubims doth sit, <i>Tho' all the World do rore.</i>
cxix. v. 70.	<i>Their Heart is as fat as Grease: [As Fat as Brawn, in another Bible. But in the Lat. Vulgat. Coagulatum est sicut lac cor eorum.]</i>	Their Hearts are swoln with worldly As Grease so are they fat. (Wealth,
Ib. v. 83.	<i>For I am become like a Bottle in the Smoak.</i>	As a Skin-Bottle in the Smoak, So am I parch'd and dry'd.
Ib. v. 110.	<i>The Wicked have laid a Snare for me.</i>	Although the wicked laid their Nets, <i>To catch me at a Bay.</i>
Ib. v. 130.	<i>The entrance of thy Word giveth Light: it giveth Understanding unto the Simple.</i>	When Men first enter into thy Word, They find a Light most clear; And very Idiots understand, <i>When they it read or hear.</i>
		<i>To say that GOD raises an ill report of Men, has affinity to Beza's Doctrine, which makes God the Author of Sin. Vid. Supr.</i> <i>I thoughts till now, that Lust had been a Sin.</i>

PSALM  
and  
VERSE.PSALMS in Prose,  
Bible 1683.

lb. v. 150.

*They draw nigh that follow  
after Mischief : they are far  
from thy Law.*

cxxx. v. 5.

*Woe is me, that I sojourn in  
Mesech, that I dwell in the  
Tents of Kedar.*

cxxxvii. v. 2.

*It is in vain for you to rise  
up early, to sit up late, to eat  
the bread of Sorrow.*

cxxxix. v. 6.

*Let them be as Grass upon  
the House-Tops, which wither-  
eth afore it growtheth up.*

I could weary the Reader with such like Examples : They seldom or never speak of GOD's Covenant with *Israel*, but they call it GOD's Trade. As in *Psalm* lxxviii. ver. 10. where they Sing,

*For why? they did not keep with GOD, the Covenant that was made;  
Nor yet would walk or lead their lives, according to his Trade.*

And in ver. 37.

*For why? their Hearts were nothing bent to Him, nor to his Trade.*

Again,

*For this is unto Israel a Statute and a Trade,  
And set all my Commandments light, and will not keep my Trade.  
To them he made a Law and Trade, &c.*

Such stuff as this you'll find in other places. The words [*More and Less*] has also stood them in as good stead as [*Trade*] to make Rhyme with, *viz.*

*All Men on Earth, both least and most.*

*All Kings, both more and less.*

*The Children of Israel, each one both more and less.*

Nor are they a little beholding to an *Ever and For Aye*. *For ever and a day. For evermore*  
*always*, and the like.

Besides

lxxxi. v. 4.

lxxxix. 32.

cxlviii. v. 6.

cxliii. v. 8.

cxlviii. v. 11.

lb. v. 14.

See Psalm

xxix. v. 10.

xi. v. 6.

xxvii. v. 8.

PSALMS in Metre,  
Bible 1683.

My Foes draw near, and do procure  
*My Death maliciously.*  
Which from thy Law are far gone back,  
*And stray'd from it lewdly.*

Alas! too long I slack,  
Within these Tents so black,  
Which Kedars are by Name ;  
*By whom the Flock Elect,*  
*And all of Isaac's Sect,*  
*Are put to open shame.*

Though ye rise early in the Morn,  
And so at Night go late to Bed,  
*Feeding full hardy with brown Bread,*  
*Yet were your labour lost and worn.*

And made as Gras upon the House,  
Which withereth ere it grow.

*Why is all this added?*  
only for the sake of  
Rhyming to the Word  
[Name,] unless they  
would make Isaac a  
Sect-Master, and his  
Religion a Sect like  
their own.

*If brown Bread is*  
the Bread of Affliction,  
a great many Feeds of  
it that are able to buy  
White.

*How Grass can wither*  
before it grows, is  
a Paradox.

Perhaps this word  
Trade should have  
been Tradition with  
them; but for fear  
of a Popish Term,  
which they so much  
detest, they had rather  
write Nonsense, than  
use it.

Besides their turning the *Psalms* into *Metre*, they also made Rhyme of the *Lord's-Prayer*, the *Creed*, and the *Ten Commandments*. In which One thing is remarkable, viz. That in the *Creed*, upon the Article of *CHRIST*'s Descent into *Hell*, they make a very plain distinction between the *Hell* of the Damned, and that of the Fathers of the Old Testament, [*Limbis Patrum*,] thus:

*And so he Died in the Flesh, but Quickned in the Sprite,  
His Body then was Buried, as is our Use and Right.  
His Soul did after this descend into the Lower Parts,  
Adread unto the wicked Spirits, but joy to faithful Hearts.*

Whom do they mean by those *Faithful Hearts*, to whom our Blessed Saviours descent into *Hell* [*Limbis*] was a *Joy*, but those, of whom the Prophet *Zachary* spake, when Prophecying of our Saviours releasing them, he said, *Thou also in the Blood of thy Testament hast let forth thy Prisoners out of the Lake, wherein there is no Water*. And, whom St. Peter meant, when he said, that *CHRIST* in Spirit Coming, *Preached to the Spirits also that were in Prison: which had been Incredulous sometimes, when they expected the Parience of GOD in the days of Noe, when the Ark was in Building*.

The turning of this Article into *Metre* is, I suppose, the very cause why we have not the *Creed* Printed in *Metre* in their latter Impressions; and consequently, none of the other Prayers and Rhymes, which their first Bibles had after the *Psalms*; because to put out this and no more, would have given too shrewd a cause of suspicion.

Besides the turning of these into *Metre*, they made also certain other Prayers of their own in Rhyme; in one of which they rank the *Pope*, (whom their Modern Divines count a *Great Biskop*, and *Chief Patriarch* of the *Western Church*, and from whom they pretend to receive their *Episcopal* and *Priestly Character*) in the same List with the *Turk*, as if both were Infidels alike, and both alike Enemies to *CHRIST*. *Roberts Wisdom* thus sets out his *Psalms*, (which the Ignorant People may be apt to take for one of *David's*; assuring themselves, that *David* himself Pray'd to be deliver'd from *Turk* and *Pope*, and consequently, that the *Pope* is a dangerous Creature.)

## R. W.

*Preserve us Lord, by thy dear Word,  
From TURK and POPE defend us Lord,  
Which both would thrust out of his Throne,  
Our Lord Jesus CHRIST, thy dear Son.*

But this, with other such like stuff, is also left out by *Protestants* in their last Impressions, as being indeed ashame of the Impiety, Malice, and Folly of these gross Impostors, especially of this *Robert Wisdom*, who ( notwithstanding his Name) was doubtless the most Ignorant of all those who ever undertook to turn *Psalms* into *Metre*. And so 'tis likely he was look'd upon by Dr. *Corbet*, sometime Bishop of *Norwich*, wher he made this following Address to his Ghost.

To the Ghost of R. *Wisdom.*

*Thou once a Body, now but Air,  
Arch-botcher of a Psalm or Prayer,*

*From Carfax\* come,*

*And patch us up a Zealous Lay,  
With an old Ever and for Aye,  
Or All and some.*

*Or such a Spirit lend me,  
As may an Hymn down send me,  
To purge my Brain.*

*Then Robin look behind thee,  
Lest Turk or Pope do find thee,  
And go to Bed again.*

This may seem too Light for a Treatise of this Nature; but the ridiculous Absurdity of these Rhymes (the singing of which in Churches, has, by several Learned *Protestants*, been complain'd of and lamented, cannot be fully enough expos'd; that so (if possible) the common Peoples Eyes may be open'd, and they may be taken off from that Fondness, they seem to have for them.

Tho' rather the *Ignorance* than *Ill-intention* of these busie Poets appear in their Psalm-Metre; yet what follows cannot be excus'd from being done with a very Treacherous design of the Translators: For what can possibly be a more fly piece of Craft to deceive the Ignorant Reader, than to use *Catholick Terms* and *Speeches* in all such places where they may render them *Odious*, and when they must needs sound Ill in the Peoples Ears? For Example, *II Maccabees 6. ver. 7.* this term *Procession*, they very Malitiously translate, saying, [*When the Feast of Bacchus was kept, they were constrain'd to go in Procession to Bacchus.*] Let the Reader see in the *Greek Lexicon*, if there be any thing in this word [*μητριαῖς τῷ διούρῳ*] like to the Catholick Churches Processions, or whether it signifie so much as to *go about*; as other of their Bibles translate it, with perhaps no less Ill-meaning than that of 1570. tho' they name not *Procession*.

Bib. 1562.  
1577.

St. John cap. 9. ver. 22. and 25. where, for [*He should be put out of the Synagogue.*] their first Translations read, *He should be Excommunicated*, to make the *Jews* doings against them that confessed *CHRIST* sound like the Catholick Churches acting against Hereticks, in Excommunicating them; as if the Churches Excommunication of such, from the Society and Participation of the Faithful, were like to that Exterior putting out of the *Synagogue*. And by this they design'd to disgrace the Priests Power of Excommunication, whereas the *Jews* had no such Spiritual Excommunication; but (as the Word only signifies) did put them out of the *Synagogue*; and so they should have translated, the *Greek Word* including the very Name *Synagogue*. But this Translation was made when the Excommunications of the *Catholick Church* were daily denounc'd against them, which they have Corrected in their last Bible, because Themselves have begun to assume such a Power of Excommunicating their Nonconformable Brethren.

In *Act 17. ver. 23.* for, [*Seeing your Idols, or, Seeing the things which you Athenians did Worship,*] they translate, *Seeing your Devotions*, as tho' *Devotion* and *Superstition* were all one.

And *ver. 24.* for [*Temples of Diana,*] they translate, *Shrines of Diana*, to make the Shrines of *Saints Bodies*, and other *Holy Reliques*, seem Odious; whereas the *Greek Word* signifies *Temples*. And *Beza* says, *He cannot see how it can signify Shrines.*

Thus they make use of *Catholick Words* and *Terms*, where they can possibly thereby render them Odious; but in other places, lest the Ancient Words and Names should still be retain'd, they change them into their own unaccustom'd and original Sound. So in the *Old Testament*, out of an Itch to shew their skill in the *Hebrew*, the first Translators thought fit to change most of the Proper Names from the usual Reading, never considering, how far differently Proper Names of all sorts are both writ and sounded in differing Languages; but this is in a great part rectify'd by the last Translators, according to the Directions of King *James the First*, that in translating the Proper Names, they should retain the usual and accustom'd manner of Speaking.

Their altering of these Proper Names in the *Old Testament*, through the Pride of being esteem'd such knowing Masters in the *Hebrew*, was yet much more tolerable, than the changing many other words in the *New*, through an Heretical Intention of introducing an utter Oblivion of them among the People.

The words *Church*, *Bisshop*, *Priest*, *Altar*, *Eucharist*, *Sacrifice*, *Grace*, *Sacrament*, *Baptism*, *Penance*, *Angel*, *Apostle*, *Christ*, &c, at their first Revolt, they suppress'd, and chang'd into *Congregation*, *Superintendent*, *Elder* and *Minister*, *Table*, *Thanksgiving*, *Gift*, *Mystery*, *Washing*, *Repentance*, *Messenger*, *Emassador*, *Anointed*; several other Words and Phrases they likewise alter'd, as is evident from what goes before. And for what cause was all this change and alteration of *Catholick Terms* and *Phrases*, but that the sound of the Words should vanish with the substance of the Things, which they have taken away? With *Bisshop* they banish'd the Pastoral Care and Charge of the *Pope*, and *Catholick Bisbops*, and set up a Child and a Woman for the Heads of their *Congregation*. With *Priest* went away the *Office of Priest*, in Offering the Holy Sacrifice of *CHRIST's Body and Blood*: With *Grace* went away the *Sacrament of Holy Orders*, and four or five of the other *Sacraments*: With *Altar*, *Eucharist*, and *Sacrifice*, they excluded the proper Service of Almighty *GOD*, with *CHRIST's Sacred Presence* in the Blest Sacrament: With the word *Penance*, they banish'd *Confession*, *Absolution*, and *Satisfaction for Sins*: They alter'd the word *Church*, because they had cut themselves off from the *Catholick Church*. And what other design could we suppose them to have had in leaving out *Apostles*, and putting in *Emassadors* or *Legates*; in leaving out *Angels*, and introducing *Messengers*; in putting down the word *Anointed*, where *CHRIST* use to be read; and in translating *Grave* for *Hell*; but in time to extinguish all *Faith* and *Memory of Apostle*, *Angel*, *Heaven*, *Hell*, *Christ* and *Christianity*, and to bring them to *Atheism* and *Infidelity*, the very center, to which their Reformation tends?

This Fantastical and Impious Vanity, in changing *Catholick* and *Christian Terms* and *Speeches* into their Prophane and Heathenish Use and Signification, was a thing so detested, even by *Beza* himself, (notwithstanding his being often guilty of the same) that he inveighs against it, and those who use it, in this manner, "The World is now come to that pass (says he) that not they only "who write their own Discourses, refuse the familiar and accustom'd Words of Scripture, as "obscure, unsavory, and out of use, but also those that translate the Scripture out of *Greek* into "Latin, challenge to themselves the like Liberty: So as whiles every Man will rather freely follow his own Judgment than Religiously behave himself as the Holy Ghost's Interpreter, many "things they do not Convert, but Pervert: For which licentiousness and boldness, except Remorse "dy be provided in time, either I am notably deceiv'd, or within few Years, instead of *Christians* "we shall become *Ciceronians* (i.e. *Pagans*): and by little and little shall lose the Possession of "the things themselves. By this you see, that tho' *Beza* was one of the greatest Masters in this Wanton, Novel, and Licentious Art of changing *Christian* for *Heathen Terms* and *Phrases*; Yet he foresaw that in the end, with the Words, would be taken away the Things signify'd, *Sacraments*, *Baptism*, *Eucharist*, *Priesthood*, *Sacrifice*, *Angels*, *Apostles*, and all *Apostolical Doctrine*: And that so we should be brought again from *Christianity* to *HEATHENISM*.

Change of  
Words indu-  
ces change of  
Faith.

*Beza in A.D.*  
c. 10. v. 46  
*Edit. Anno*  
1556, *but in*  
*the latter E-*  
*dit of 1565.*  
*Some of these*  
*words are al-*  
*ter'd either by*  
*himself or the*  
*Prinser.*

Dr. Stillinger,  
charge of Pa-  
lmary, against  
the Church of  
Rome, pag. 7.  
8 pag. 40.

From WHICH, And from the STILLINGFLERIAN  
ERROR, that (by asserting, The Pagan God Jupiter,  
to be the True GOD, blessed for evermore) throws open  
the Door of Jupiter's Temple, and points out the  
very Path-way to Paganism,

GOOD LORD DELIVER US!

FINIS.

The Candid Reader is desir'd to Correct these following ERRATAS, before his  
Perusal, especially those that are mark'd, \*

**P**reface, pag. 2. Marg. for 1085, read 1580. Prof. p. 6. l. 31. for \* not found in one place, read  
found not in one place. And line 34. for \* though it agree, i. though it agree not. Prof. p. 11. l.  
7. after the word Brethren, must be read, " As in behalf of their Character, they recy'd [Ordaining  
Elders by Election.] Prof. p. 12. l. 16. for Irreformans i. Irreformans. fol. 2. l. 23. for Unborn, Un-  
swor'd. In f. 35. Marg. for Let. Pat. Urneb. &c. read, K. Edw. VI. his Let. Pat. Jo. Utention. p.  
17. Regis. Eccl. Perogr. London. Calvin. p. 327. It esp. ad peritos Angl. f. 57. l. 36. for Statutes,  
i. Statutes. f. 83. l. 23. for For as you, i. For not as you.

